ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 101 1-06-67 24 (REV)
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE DROPOUTS, FINAL REPORT.
SUCZEK, ROBERT F. * ALFERT, ELIZABETH
BVE08462 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY CAMPUS
CRP-S-110
BR-5-8232
- -66 OEC-5-10-191
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.00 75P.

*DROPOUT ATTITUDES, *DROPOUT CHARACTERISTICS, DROPOUT PROBLEMS, *DROPOUT IDENTIFICATION, *PERSONALITY STUDIES, *DROPOUT RESEARCH, COLLEGE STUDENTS, QUESTIONNAIRES, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY (OPI), ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE, AUTHORITARIANISM SCALE

AN INVESTIGATION WAS MADE OF THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE DROPOUTS. PERSONALITY INVENTORIES AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES WERE USED TO DISTINGUISH PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS UNIQUE OR ESPECIALLY PREVALENT AMONG DROPOUTS. THE PERSONALITY SCALE DATA AND MOST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA USED IN THE STUDY WERE MADE AVAILABLE FROM ANOTHER STUDY. THE POPULATION IN BOTH STUDIES WAS THE BODY OF STUDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, AS FRESHMEN IN THE FALL OF 1961. OVER A 4-YEAR PERIOD, THE TOTAL SAMPLE OF DROPOUTS WAS ACCUMULATED. SPECIFIC PERIODS IN WHICH THE STUDENTS DROPPED OUT CONSTITUTED A NUMBER OF SUBDIVISIONS OF THE POPULATION. THE ATTITUDE AND OPINION SURVEY WAS MADE UP OF SIX SCALES FROM THE OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY (OPI), THE ETHNOCENTRISM AND AUTHORITARIANISM SCALES, AND TWO OTHER INVENTORIES. FOR PURPOSES OF ITEM ANALYSIS, ITEMS FROM ALL OF THE SIX OPI SCALES WERE USED. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS WERE--(1) THE COLLEGE DROPOUT PHENOMENON WAS NOT SO ALARMING AS IT IS FREQUENTLY THOUGHT TO BE, (2) STUDENTS WHO LEFT THE UNIVERSITY PURSUED DIVERSE PATHS (THE MAJORITY WENT TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND COULD NOT BE LUMPED TOGETHER AS "DROPOUTS"), AND (3) REVISION OF COLLEGE PROGRAMS TO MEET THE VARIED NEEDS OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS WILL LIKELY REDUCE FREQUENCY. (JC)

ED010101

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Bureau — 5-8232
Contract-OE-5-10-191
Old No. 5-110

FINAL REPORT

--

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
of
COLLEGE DROPOUTS

Cooperative Research Project No. 5-8232

Robert F. Suczek, Ph.D.

and

Elizabeth Alfert, Ph.D.

Department of Psychiatry, Student Health Service

University of California, Berkeley

1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express special thanks to Joseph Katz, Research Coordinator, Student Development Study and Research Director, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, California; and to the Berkeley staff of the Student Development Study for their interest, their many helpful suggestions and their efforts in making this study possible. We also wish to express thanks to Barry Dorfman, senior medical student, University of California Medical School, San Francisco, California who worked with us as Research Trainee (USPHS Medical Student Research Trainee program; USPHS 1-SO-1 FR 5355-04-5 and 5-T-5 GM 43-04). Mr. Dorfman's keen interest and untiring work made the follow-up study possible. Finally, our appreciation to Max Levin, Co-Director, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, California, for reading and commenting on the manuscript; and to Mervin B. Freedman, Chairman, Department of Psychology, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California for his detailed and critical editing of the final report.

Table of Contents

Page

PROBLEM 1

RELATED LITERATURE 2

OBJECTIVES 2

PROCEDURE 3

RESULTS 8

Male Dropouts and Male Continuing Students 9

Male Dropouts in Good Standing 11

Male Dropouts Who Are Failing 12

Reasons for Leaving - Male Dropouts 15

Male Dropout Groups Leaving at Different Times 19

Female Dropouts and Female Continuing Students 23

Female Dropouts in Good Standing 23

Female Dropouts Who Are Failing 24

Reasons for Leaving - Female Dropouts 26

Female Dropout Groups Leaving at Different Times 28

Follow-Up Study 31

Qualitative Observations 34

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 37

APPENDIX 43

Bibliography

Tables

Questionnaire

PROBLEM

For the last few years in September about 3000 new freshman students register at the University of California Berkeley campus. By the opening of the following fall semester 25 percent of these students have left Berkeley and are classified as dropouts. By the end of the second year the number of those who have left is approaching 40 percent. During the 4-year period following their initial admission a total of approximately 59 percent of the original group interrupt their stay at Berkeley. During this period about 9 percent return. Thus, in all, only about 50 percent of the original group entering the University are still registered at the end of the fourth year. Similar proportions are reported for American colleges and universities generally. Summerskill, in a review of research (11) states: "In summary, American colleges lose, on the average, approximately half their students in the four years after matriculation." Sexton, in another comprehensive review of the problem (10) states: "A 1958 report of U.S. Office of Education records that one out of every four students leave college before the second year. A slightly higher percent drops out during the three succeeding years. In other words, more than half of those admitted withdraw."

University administrators and educators generally decry this large attrition rate and express concern over the waste of manpower and money both on the part of the university and on the part of the student. Political leaders and responsible citizens also are concerned with the apparent loss to the nation's resources. Statements such as the following are common in the literature on attrition: (Sexton) "In spite of improved admission techniques, current dropout figures are alarmingly high. Responsibility of colleges to reduce the dropout rate has been stressed by many authorities..." Furthermore, Summerskill points out that the attrition rate has not changed appreciably during the 40 years' period that research has been done in this area. These are the overall dimensions of the problem.

Much of the concern about the problem is based on the assumption that dropouts do not continue their schooling. However, some studies indicate that many dropouts do continue their education at other schools.

Whatever the case may be, there are many questions of a psychological nature about dropouts that could be usefully answered. For example: what are the young men and women like who drop out? Can they be distinguished, in terms of personality characteristics, from the students who remain on campus? Why do they leave college? Are there different reasons for leaving at different times during the college career? Are there positive as well as negative reasons for leaving (i.e., contributing to or detrimental to personality development)? What do they do after leaving college?

Answers to those questions make possible a more realistic appraisal and may suggest what action, if any, needs to be taken.

RELATED LITERATURE

Summerskill, in his introduction to a comprehensive summary of the literature on the college dropout (11) states: "Previous research arose chiefly in institutional or administrative concerns, and only rarely has the process of attrition been analyzed in psychological or sociological terms." The research that has been done is discussed by Summerskill under these headings, each representing a group of causes associated with withdrawal: Biological and Social, Academic, Motivation, Adjustment, Illness and Injury, and Finances. In considering the need for further research, Summerskill states: "Demographic factors and scholastic aptitude and performance have been thoroughly investigated. But college students are growing, striving, thinking, aspiring individuals. In much prior research, 'the student is classified rather than understood'; future research might well 'attempt insight into the frame of reference of the student himself' (Craven, 1951)."

The present research aims at such understanding of attrition among students. Personality inventories and responses to questionnaires are used to distinguish personality characteristics that are unique or especially prevalent among dropouts.

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to investigate the personality characteristics of college dropouts. Specific research issues were:

1. Whether students who drop out from college can be shown to have some measurable personality characteristics which differentiate them from students who remain in college.

2. Whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out when they are failing and students who drop out while in good standing.

3. Whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out at different times in their college career.

4. Whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out of college and then continue their educational pursuits from those who do not continue.

5. Whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who continue in different kinds of educational settings after dropping out.

6. What positive or negative values related to personality development can be demonstrated in the dropout's college experience.

PROCEDURE

All the personality scale data and two thirds of the questionnaire data used in this study were made available by another study.[1] The population for both studies is the students who entered the University of California, Berkeley, as first semester freshmen in the fall of 1961. For the original study, approximately 2000 of these students responded, at the time of their entrance, to the Attitude and Opinion Survey (see below). For the purposes of the present study, students were eliminated from the sample who were listed as withdrawals or dropouts by the Registrar but who were in fact students either attending a campus abroad or participating in the Cooperative Work-Study Program (these students will be discussed later). Elimination of these students resulted in a sample of 1621 students, 888 males and 756 females. Of this total, 728 students were listed as dropouts by the Registrar at some time during the 4 years encompassed by this study.

Certain limitations of sampling must be noted. Although all of the entering freshmen (approximately 3300 in all) were asked to take the Attitude and Opinion Survey, conflicts in schedules and other reasons eliminated about 25 percent. Also a number of tests had to be dropped from the total because of errors in numbering, large percentages of unanswered items, and the like. The questionnaire was sent to a randomly selected sample of dropouts regardless of whether they had taken the Attitude and Opinion Survey. This sample to whom questionnaires were to be sent through the mail was reduced by the fact that some of the addresses were no longer current and no forwarding address was available. Moreover, about 30 percent of the subjects to whom the questionnaires were sent did not respond.

For these reasons, aside from the sex of the student and the time of his or her dropping out, the same data were not uniformly available for all subjects. However, it is possible to assess sampling bias by comparing the respondents among the dropouts with those who did not take the tests or return the questionnaires. In Table A1 subjects who completed the personality scales are compared with those who did not in terms of grade point average and post-dropout educational status. All P values are greater than .05, suggesting no significant bias in the sample of students for whom personality scale scores are available. In Table A3 subjects who returned questionnaires and those who did not are compared on the basis of personality scale scores. Again significance levels suggest no sampling bias.

It is of interest to note some of the other difficulties in constituting a sample of dropouts. The present sample was defined by use of lists of withdrawals and dropouts made available by the Registrar's office. When students thus included in our sample were asked through the mail to respond to a questionnaire about their experiences at Berkeley, some responded that they had not dropped out but were, in fact, still registered on this campus and attending classes. Further investigation revealed that these were students who had transferred to one of the campuses abroad to continue their education there for one semester and had then returned to Berkeley (the questionnaires were sent to them from 3 to 6 months after the time they allegedly dropped out). Some of the responses to our questionnaires were from anguished parents who, apparently in the absence of their child, opened the letter forwarding the questionnaire and were startled to learn he or she was a "dropout". A similar problem existed in connection with the students in the Cooperative Work-Study Program. (This is a program in the College of Engineering which makes it possible for students to alternate a semester on campus with 4 to 6 months of work in an industry they are considering for a career choice.) They too eliminated themselves from responding to the questionnaire as "dropouts", some in alarm and some in amusement. The foregoing groups may be considered to be improperly labeled as dropouts and are not included in the dropout samples as such. Counted among the dropouts in this study are those students who spend 2 or 3 years on the Berkeley campus and then transfer to a professional school such as medicine, nursing, dentistry or pharmacy. This group comprises .09 percent of the total number of dropouts. The fact that these students are recorded as withdrawals or dropouts may aggravate the dropout phenomenon to unnecessary proportions.

---

[1] Student Development Study, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, California. U.S. Office of Education Project #1355.

Except for students attending overseas campuses of the University of California or those participating in the Cooperative Work-Study Program the sample of dropouts includes all students who prior to the end of the fourth year were registered at the beginning of one semester but not at the beginning of the next semester. Dropping out may have been voluntary, or the student may have been dismissed by the University.[1]

The total sample of dropouts was accumulated gradually over the 4 years from 1961 and was divided into a number of subgroups. Subdivisions were based on the period during the 4 years when the student dropped out. The initial group (DS I) was limited to those who dropped out during or at the end of the first semester. The questionnaire was mailed to them during the semester immediately following, in the spring of 1962. The second group (DS II) included those who dropped out in the second and third semesters. They received the questionnaire during the fourth semester, in the spring of 1963. The third group (DS III) included those dropping out at the end of the second year of college, that is, during or at the end of the fourth semester, in the spring of 1963. They received the questionnaire the following fall. That questionnaire terminated the data collection done by the original study.

The final questionnaire was sent out by this study in the spring of 1965 to the fourth group (DS IV). That group was made up of students dropping out in the fifth, sixth and seventh semesters, through the winter of 1964. Dropouts in the eighth semester were not included in this study.

---

[1] On this campus students who do not maintain a GPA of 2.0 can remain on probation for two semesters. If the average is not achieved in that time, they are dismissed.

Practical considerations made it necessary to distribute the work of data collection over the 4-year period. The particular time divisions described above were made on the assumption that different psychological factors might be related to dropping out at these different times during the usual 4-year college sequence.

Besides this temporal division, the dropout sample was divided into those leaving with a grade point average below 2.0 and those having an average of 2.0 or greater. Finally, for most of the analysis, men and women were considered separately.

The balance of the 1621 students made up the control sample. All of these were students who remained continuously registered at this campus during the 4 years commencing in the fall of 1961.

The Attitude and Opinion Survey which these 1621 students had responded to at the time of their entrance into college, was made up of six scales taken from the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI),[1] a list of adjectives for describing oneself, the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism Scales,[2] an unpublished scale of attitudes regarding alcohol and drinking behavior, and an unpublished scale bearing on attitudes about man. For the purposes of the item analyses, items from all of the six OPI scales[3] were used together with the self-descriptive adjectives. Total scale scores were obtained only for the Ethnocentrism Scale, the Authoritarianism Scale and two of the OPI scales, namely, the Impulse Expression Scale and the Social Maturity Scale. A brief characterization of the personality variables measured by each scale follows.

> Ethnocentrism Scale (E) - This scale is described in The Authoritarian Personality (p. 150): "Ethnocentrism is based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves stereotyped negative imagery and hostile attitudes regarding outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate."

---

[1] Omnibus Personality Inventory, Research Manual, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley 4, California, 1962.

[2] T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper, 1950.

[3] Impulse Expression, Social Maturity, Estheticism, Masculinity-Femininity, Schizoid Function and Developmental Status.

Fascism Scale (F) - A measure of Authoritarianism, this scale is described in The Authoritarian Personality (p. 228): "A number of (such) variables were derived and defined and they, taken together, made up the basic content of the F scale. Each was regarded as a more or less central trend in the person which, in accordance with some dynamic process, expressed itself on the surface in ethnocentrism as well as in diverse psychologically related opinions and attitudes. These variables are listed below, together with a brief definition of each.

a. Conventionalism. Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
b. Authoritarian submission. Submissive, uncritical attitudes toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
c. Authoritarian aggression. Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
d. Anti-intraception. Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tenderminded.
e. Superstition and stereotypy. The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
f. Power and "toughness." Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
g. Destructiveness and cynicism. Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
h. Projectivity. The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
i. Sex. Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

These variables were thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic propaganda. One might say, therefore, that the F scale attempts to measure the potentially antidemocratic personality.

Impulse Expression Scale (IE) - According to the Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual (2), "this scale assesses a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action. The high scorers value sensations, have an active imagination, and their thinking is often dominated by feelings and fantasies." Correlations with other scales "suggest a person who is not 'other-directed' or particularly concerned with conforming to social norms."

Social Maturity Scale (SM) - The Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual (2) states that, "High scorers are not authoritarian, and they are flexible, tolerant and realistic in their thinking. They are not dependent upon authority, rules, or rituals for managing social relationships. In general they are impunitive, although capable of expressing aggression directly when it is appropriate. High scorers are also frequently interested in intellectual and esthetic pursuits."

These particular scales were selected for evaluation, because it has been demonstrated that they measure important aspects of personality change that occur during the college years (13). It seemed likely that these scales would be related to the phenomenon of dropping out. Concerning the Impulse Expression Scale, Sanford has stated (9), and some experimental evaluations of this scale have been carried out (Suczek and Alfert, unpublished paper, mimeo.) which suggest that there may be two different kinds of individuals who score high. One is a well integrated person whose impulses are under conscious control. His actions are appropriate to the situation. The other expresses impulses directly, in compulsive or uncontrolled fashion. Some of the findings to be described below support this conception.

The questionnaire sent to the first group of dropouts (DO I) was designed to obtain information from the student in several areas: the student's plans in coming to college and the student's and parents' attitudes toward college; the student's academic and social experiences at college and events leading up to his leaving; the student's activities since leaving and his future plans. All of this was left as unstructured as possible so that the student could make a relatively spontaneous statement in his own words in each of the above areas. In addition, the questionnaire included a list of 42 commonly stated reasons for leaving college, subdivided into "Circumstances" (i.e., situational factors), "Academic" and "Personal." The student could check as many of these as he wished and was asked to indicate the three most important ones for him, in the order of their importance.

The original questionnaire was slightly revised and expanded to provide for greater clarity of the questions and more space for responding. The revised form covered the same areas of information. It was used for DO II, DO III and DO IV, and was mailed from 3 to 6 months following the end of the semester in which the student left.

The letter forwarding the questionnaire described the research and the hope that it, with the help of the student's response, would eventually contribute to planning of future college curricula and to the educational process as a whole. The first letter was accompanied by a questionnaire and a stamped return envelope. If a student did not respond, he was sent a second letter two weeks later; and if there was still no response, a third letter was sent together with another copy of the questionnaire and a new return envelope. Approximately 70 percent of each of the four DS groups returned a completed questionnaire.

A few of the questionnaires were filled out and returned by parents. These questionnaires were not used in the data analysis. A large number of returns from students contained letters or additional pages used to "tell the whole story." Many letters or notes on the back of the questionnaire thanked the researchers for their interest and for the opportunity to discuss the problem. Many stated that this was the only interest any one at this University had shown them and the only opportunity anyone had given them to "say what happened."

Finally, follow-up data were gathered by means of a post card questionnaire. Twelve to eighteen months following their leaving Berkeley, those dropouts who had returned a questionnaire were sent a new request. This was to fill out and return a brief questionnaire printed on a post card. On the post card the student was able to indicate whether he had been in college or had worked during the previous year. The student was asked to name the college, to indicate what type of work he had been engaged in, and to convey his future plans for school and work. A slightly expanded and more detailed post card questionnaire was sent to DS II and III in the spring of 1965. This was a two year follow-up for DS II and a one year follow-up for DS III. In the case of the DS IV students the original questionnaire requested this information obviating the need of a post card.

Different kinds of statistical analysis were used with the different kinds of data. Dropouts and continuing students, or various groups of dropouts, were compared on personality measures by analyzing the differences between means for the various scales by t-test or, where more than two groups were involved, by analysis of variance.

Personality scale items differentiating between two groups were identified by means of a program of item analysis devised by E.S. Krasnow, of the Institute of Human Development, U.C. Berkeley. This program tested the items by means of Chi Square or by means of the exact Fisher test, where an expected frequency was less than ten.

Data obtained from the questionnaire and the follow-up post card were analyzed by comparing differences in percentages or by comparing frequencies by means of Chi Square.

RESULTS

The results will be presented in the following order. First, a description of all male dropouts compared with male continuing students. Second, male dropouts who are in good standing when they drop out. Third, male dropouts who are failing at the time they drop out. Fourth, reasons for dropping out given by the failing and passing dropouts. Fifth, characteristics of male dropouts leaving at different times. The same five descriptions of the female dropouts follow. Finally, the results of the follow-up study will be summarized for both male and female dropouts, and some qualitative observations will be discussed.

Results of the personality measures characterize students as of the time they were tested at college entrance. These measures do not necessarily characterize the student at the time of dropping out. Scores on these scales often change during the college years (see Webster, Freedman and Heist, 1962).

MALE DROPOUTS AND MALE CONTINUING STUDENTS

Dropouts score significantly higher on the Impulse Expression (IE) Scale (Table I). A significantly larger proportion of dropouts are represented among the top one-third of the distribution of IE scores for the whole population, than in the middle third or lower third of that distribution. Thus it may be said that, as a group, dropouts are more likely to show "...a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action." They "...value sensations, have an active imagination and their thinking is often dominated by feelings and fantasies."

In the item analysis of all six of the OPI scales and of the descriptive adjectives, 594 items in all, this characterization is borne out. Fourteen items differentiate the dropouts from the nondropouts at the .01 percent level, 31 items at the .05 percent level and 23 items at the .10 percent level of significance.

Male dropouts subscribe significantly more often to items that characterize them as:

rebellious

"I have often either broken rules (school, club, etc.) or inwardly rebelled against them." .01 percent
"I have sometimes wanted to run away from home." .01 percent
"I have always hated regulations." .10 percent
"I have often gone against my parents wishes." .10 percent

adventurous

"I think I would like to drive a racing car." .01 percent
"I have the wanderlust and am happiest when I am roaming or traveling about." .01 percent

aware of conflict with their family

"Once in a while I feel hatred towards members of my family whom I usually love." .05 percent
"My people treat me more like a child than an adult." .05 percent

non-conforming

"I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours is not congenial to my temperament." .05 percent
"I dislike following a set schedule." .10 percent

interested in innovation and experiment

"Some of my friends think my ideas are a bit impractical if not a bit wild." .01 percent
"I like to fool around with new ideas even if they turn out later to have been a total waste of time." .05 percent

interested in intellectual and esthetic pursuits

"I enjoy spending leisure time in writing poetry, plays, stories or essays." .05 percent

"I have spent a lot of time listening to serious music." .05 percent
"I like to discuss philosophical problems." .10 percent

interested in a variety of experience and sensation
"Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low." .01 percent
"I think I would like to drive a racing car." .01 percent
"I have used alcohol excessively." .05 percent
"I like to listen to primitive music." .10 percent

confused about themselves
"I do not understand myself." .05 percent

and having difficulty in functioning
"I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have." .05 percent
"I have sometimes felt that difficulties were piling up so high that I could not overcome them." .10 percent

In comparison, the male students who continue through 4 years without interruption present a generally more conventional set of attitudes. Items subscribed to more often by them suggest:

cautiousness and preference for the status-quo
"Usually I prefer known ways of doing things rather than trying out new ways." .01 percent
"I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it." .05 percent
"All groups can live in harmony in this country without changing the system in any way." .05 percent

dislike of ambiguity
"I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable." .10 percent
"I dislike test questions in which the information being tested is in a form different from that in which it was learned." .10 percent
"When I work I prefer to be alone rather than to have others around me." .01 percent

planfulness
"I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized." .01 percent

conformance to duty and convention
"A person who doesn't vote is not a good citizen." .05 percent
"I enjoy teas and receptions." .05 percent

ambitiousness
"I always tried to make the best school grades that I could." .01 percent
"Although I seldom admit it, my secret ambition is to become a great person." .01 percent

"I want to be an important person in the community." .10 percent
"No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power." .10 percent

Some items and the adjectives they prefer for self-description suggest that they experience moderate amount of tension:

"I am inclined to take things hard." .05 percent
"People often disappoint me." .05 percent
"At times I feel like swearing." .10 percent
"cautious, excitable, resentful, tactless, tense." .05 percent
"emotional, conventional." .10 percent

Adjectives which indicate what they expect to be like after college, suggest that they hold an optimistic outlook about the future.

In summary, male students who drop out, as a total group compared to the non-dropouts, are characterized by independence and rebelliousness, by conflict with family, with authority and with convention. They are adventurous both in terms of physical activity and in the realm of ideas, and express interest in intellectual pursuits. They feel somewhat confused and are aware of having difficulty in functioning. The latter factor may reflect both confusion and difficulty per se, as well as the fact that the dropouts are aware of and able to admit such things about themselves.

By comparison, continuing male students are cautious, less aware of conflict and more dutiful. They have a definite preference for the status quo and a dislike for uncertainty. They are ambitious and conventional. Although they indicate some tension, they have a generally more optimistic outlook about their future and are less aware of difficulty in functioning than dropouts.

MALE DROPOUTS IN GOOD STANDING

Male dropouts who were in good academic standing at the time they dropped out were compared with continuing students. There were no statistically significant differences between them on the four personality scales being considered (Table II). However, the male dropouts have a somewhat higher mean score on the Social Maturity scale, suggesting that they are, as a group, more flexible and less bound by convention than the continuing students. There are individual scale items that are checked significantly more often by each group which bear out the same qualities. Two items differentiate the groups at the .01 percent level, 28 at the .05 percent level and 30 at the .10 percent level. In this comparison, the dropouts are again characterized by independence, rebelliousness and relative freedom to express impulses. This quality, however, is somewhat moderated by regard for other people, as exemplified in the item:

"I occasionally express appreciation personally to a lecturer, soloist, or other performer at a school or community program." (.05 percent)

In addition to the characteristics that are described above, of the entire dropout group, this group displays feelings of sensitivity or poignancy, for example:

> "I am more sensitive than most people." (.10 percent)
> "My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others." (.10 percent)

Finally, there is a quality of control suggested by some items which was not so evident in the characterization of the entire group:

> "I often count things that are not important." (.05 percent)
> "Patient" (.05 percent) "Modest" (.05 percent) "Calm" (.10 percent)

In summary, the dropouts in good academic standing are not markedly different from continuing students except that they are somewhat freer to experience and act on their feelings, more sensitive and more tolerant and considerate of others. Continuing students as before are more conventional, controlled, orderly and ambitious.

MALE DROPOUTS WHO ARE FAILING

Male dropouts who are failing at the time of dropping out are considerably different from their male colleagues who continue in school. In some respects they also differ from those students who drop out in good standing.

First, comparing these three groups with each other, the group of dropouts in good standing is the highest group in mean score on the Social Maturity Scale, the failing dropout group is intermediate and the continuing group is the lowest on that scale. The Social Maturity Scale measures a dimension of "Non-authoritarianism" or, putting it more positively, of general flexibility, complexity and autonomy.

Next, on the dimension of impulse expression the dropouts in good standing and the continuing students have almost identical mean scores. The failing dropouts have a significantly higher score than the other two groups (Table II).

In other words, the dropouts in good standing, compared to the other two groups, are characterized by more complexity and flexibility of personality. The failing dropouts may be characterized as more uncontrolled and impulsive than the other two groups and the continuing students as more conventional and less complex than the other two.

When the failing dropout group and the continuing student group are compared, two differences emerge. First, the failing dropouts are significantly higher in mean score on the Impulse Expression Scale. They are more rebellious and independent. They are likely to seek gratification of impulses in action and in fantasy. Secondly, the failing dropouts are significantly higher on the Ethnocentrism Scale. They are more inclined to be rigid in their thinking. They are hostile toward outgroups and submissive to authority.

One hundred and sixteen items differentiate the male dropouts who were failing at the time of dropping out from the continuing students; 22 at the .01 percent level of confidence, 58 at the .05 percent level and 36 at the .10 percent level. The same characteristics are represented as have been presented for all dropouts. However, failing dropouts subscribe somewhat more to items which reflect rebelliousness and a type of impulsivity that clamors for immediate gratification regardless of future considerations. The most extreme examples are:

> "At times I feel like picking a fist-fight with someone." .01 percent
> "I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful here and now even at the cost of some distant goal." .05 percent

Unstable control over impulses also appears more prominently among items subscribed to by the failing dropouts;

> "I have had periods of days, weeks or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't 'get going'." .05 percent
> "I have had periods when I felt so full of pep that sleep did not seem necessary for days at a time." .05 percent
> "Sometimes an unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days." .10 percent

Rather simple, primitive morality is suggested by items which show a lack of regard for others:

> "I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who leaves himself open to it." .05 percent
> "A person who lets himself get tricked has no one but himself to blame." .05 percent

Finally the failing dropout group is characterized by a rather confused sense of self:

> "I have little or no idea what I will be like a few years from now." .05 percent
> "I do not understand myself." .05 percent

The items which significantly differentiate the continuing students from the failing dropouts reflect the same attitudes as before, although more clearly. In other words, the items most characteristic of the continuing student cohere in a purer fashion. Conventionality, organization and ambition are the principal themes. Items that did not appear in the comparison with all dropouts now emerge to stress dutifulness, stoicism and goodness:

> "I have been inspired to a way of life based on duty which I have carefully followed." .10 percent

> "I believe we are made better by the trials and hardships of life." .10 percent

An item analysis was also carried out to compare directly the two dropout groups - the failing dropouts and those in good standing. Eighty two items differentiate the two groups: 9 items at the .01 percent level of confidence, 35 at the .05 percent level and 37 at the .10 percent level. In this comparison, the dropouts who are in good standing subscribe to many of the same items chosen by the continuing students in the previous comparisons. Some of these items suggest that the dropouts in good standing are concerned also with conventional accomplishments, with order, with dutifulness, with control, and with regard for other people:

> "I always tried to make the best school grades that I could." .01 percent
> "I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized." .10 percent
> "I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it." .10 percent
> "I have very few quarrels with members of my family." .10 percent
> "Nothing about fascism is any good." .05 percent
> "I occasionally express appreciation personally to a lecturer, soloist, or other performer at a school or community program." .10 percent

Adjectives used to describe the self or the ideal self reflect essentially equable or rational attitudes:

> "modest, reflective, undemanding, companionable, generous, intelligent, patient."

In general, this comparison demonstrates some of the similarities between the dropouts in good standing and the continuing students. In addition to these similarities, dropouts in good standing also show a kind of openness, flexibility and maturity that is not as evident among the continuing students.

In comparison with the dropouts in good standing the item preferences of the failing dropouts strongly emphasize a kind of irrational impulsivity. For example, in addition to some of the previously stated items, they subscribe to items like:

> "Sometimes I feel like smashing things." .05 percent

This group of items chosen by the failing dropouts also stresses qualities of rebelliousness, a simple, primitive morality, changeable controls and confused self-conception.

The item analysis and the mean score differences suggest that the male dropouts who leave in good standing are among the most mature students on campus, while the dropouts who are failing academically are among the more immature. The continuing students by comparison fall between the two positions. They are less complex, more conventional and more task-oriented as a group than either of the other two groups of students.

REASONS FOR LEAVING GIVEN BY MALE DROPOUTS

Some further understanding of the male dropout group and of the subgroups may be gained from an examination of the reasons for leaving. There are two sources of these data. First are the spontaneous statements made by the students in their own words in the mail questionnaire, describing their experiences at Berkeley and the circumstances of their leaving. The contents of these statements were classified in 16 categories.

The second source of data is the list of reasons for dropping out which were to be checked and ranked by the student respondent. Because the ranking was not done consistently by the students, the ranks were ignored; and instead the frequency of check was used to determine the rank of each item in each of the three appropriate categories - Circumstances, Academic, Personal.

The 16 specific reasons for dropping out which emerged from the analysis of the spontaneous responses, plus a category for miscellaneous other reasons (each of which was given by only one or two students) are presented in Table IV. This classification of 16 represents the primary reason stated by each student. Most students gave more than one reason. Where two or more reasons were given they tended to be interrelated. This classification is a summary of the primary reasons given by each student.

The five most frequent primary reasons for dropping out given by male students are, in descending order of frequency (i.e., percentage of the group giving the reason):

1.	Academic pressure too great and dismissed because of poor grades.	(38.9 percent)
2.	Lack of motivation.	(13.1 percent)
3.	Transfer to a professional school.	(8.7 percent)
4.	Financial difficulties.	(7.1 percent)
5.	Feelings of isolation.	(6.0 percent)

It is interesting to note that 52 percent of the primary reasons given for dropping out have to do directly with some form of difficulty in academic work. The one other primary reason (sixth in order of frequency) that is directly related to academic life is one summarized as "Dissatisfaction with curriculum and teaching." If this percentage is added to the above, then a total of 56 percent of the reasons given for dropping out by male students are directly related to the academic part of college life per se. Of course, many of the other reasons are indirectly related to academic work, for example, financial difficulties or feelings of isolation. Thus a substantial proportion of the reasons for dropping out are directly related to academic performance.

"Academic pressure" is a classification that includes a variety of different individual circumstances or difficulties. For example, some of the students giving this reason simply could not do satisfactory work in their courses. On the other hand, some students were able to achieve passing grades but in order to do so had to devote every bit of time and energy to it; they felt doubtful about being able to sustain such an effort over a 4-year period. Many of the students in these two instances stated frankly that they were poorly prepared by their high school work or had never learned to study in high school. Another group of students felt that the demands of their academic program left them with no time to pursue other interests, both intellectual and social. Some students whose responses are included under "academic pressure" indicated concerns other than inability or difficulty in doing passing work. For example, students who needed a high grade point average to be admitted to professional school or graduate school left Berkeley for an easier college where they could be assured of higher grades. Still another instance is the following: Students on probation in a major, such as engineering, who wish to change their major to a Letters and Science field are required to have a passing grade point average in order to change. These students often have to leave for another college to recoup their grades and then return to their new major at Berkeley.

There is a discernible attitude along the dimension of internalization versus externalization which is evident in many of the statements about academic pressure. Some students place the onus on the University, the administration, the faculty, etc., with no regard for their own part in their academic difficulty. Others see themselves as being unable to do college level work and accept everything about the University unquestioningly. An example of this difference in attitude is evident among the failing students. Some of them say "I flunked out", while others say, "The only reason I left was because I was forced to leave. The dean wouldn't let me stay".

In many instances of transfer to a professional school prior to completing 4 years of college students apparently had planned to stay in college only long enough to qualify for a professional school. In many other instances students seemed to be "escaping" the academic demands of college into a more narrowly defined area of study and work.

"Financial difficulty" as a reason for dropping out may at times represent a denial of inability to get passing grades. Sometimes, however, the questionnaires make it clear that having to work full or part time made it difficult for the students to devote sufficient time to their academic work. Some students on scholarships, unable to maintain the 3.0 average necessary to continue receiving the scholarship, drop out to earn money to continue. Many of the latter comment on the sense of relief from pressure that follows such a change.

"Feelings of isolation" ranks relatively high as a primary reason for dropping out. It is also given frequently as a secondary reason. In this classification belong a variety of expressions of loneliness, friendlessness, distance from other students and faculty. It appears to be a phenomenon of mass education in a mass society and an expression of the feelings of ego-deflation that frequently accompany the change from being a "somebody" in high school and in one's family to being a "hole in an IBM card" on a college campus of 27,000 students.

Male dropouts in good standing give a different distribution of reasons with a different emphasis than those given by all male dropouts combined:

1.	Transfer to professional school.	(19.8 percent)
2.	Financial difficulty.	(13.2 percent)
3.	Academic pressure too great.	(12.4 percent)
4.	Lack of motivation.	(9.0 percent)
5.	Travel or wanting a break in education.	(7.9 percent)

Almost tied for fifth rank is "Dissatisfied with curriculum and teaching". (7.3 percent)

Academic pressure is still fairly high among the reasons given most frequently by the dropouts in good standing. A number of these students were actually in excellent standing. Of the students returning a questionnaire, 11.7 percent had a grade point average of 3.0 or above. Many of these complained of the pressure of academic work, but they emphasized particularly work which they felt to be meaningless and unrelated; a "memorization and regurgitation" process which seemed necessary to get grades but which seemed to them not useful, interesting or stimulating. Some of these gave reasons for leaving which were classified under "Dissatisfied with curriculum and teaching."

The fifth most frequent reason, "Travel or wanting a break in education", is a representation of concerns of a more personal nature. The students giving this reason either felt tired of school or felt they needed to clarify their thinking about school. Many of them stated that they had been going to school steadily, with the exception of summertime, all their lifetime, and they needed to experience something different for a while in order to refresh themselves and gain perspective. For others it was a matter of taking school and college for granted, and they now needed to pause and reflect on what they were doing and why. In many instances there was a more or less explicit flavor of rebelliousness or seeking of a sense of independence ("I want to see if I can take care of myself") in addition to the introspective overtones.

Dropouts who are failing, as might be expected, give "academic pressure" and "dismissal" as the reason for leaving most frequently. Obviously, some are not "dropouts" voluntarily. They are dismissed by the administration because of not maintaining a grade point average of 2.0. Many of these, even though failing, feel bitter about their dismissal and insist that they would stay on, even though failing, if the administration would let them. Something of the unrealistic thinking described above in the item analyses is evident in this kind of response.

Other students in the failing group do not hang on to the bitter end. They apparently see the handwriting on the wall and leave of their own accord without going through a period of probation or waiting to be dismissed. The five most frequent reasons given by the male failing dropouts are:

1.	Academic pressure and forced to leave.	(60.9 percent)
2.	Lack of motivation for college work.	(15.3 percent)
3.	Immaturity and overindulgence in non-academic activities.	(5.9 percent)
4.	Feelings of isolation.	(5.1 percent)
5.	Finances.	(3.1 percent)

It is worthy of note that some 20 percent of these students are able, at least retrospectively, to acknowledge lack of motivation and immaturity as contributing to their inability to function effectively in college. Many more students mention lack of motivation, immaturity and feelings of isolation as reasons secondary to academic pressure. Apparently the experiences leading to dropping out can sometimes be useful in providing a clearer awareness of one's talents, interests, motivations and level of maturity.

In this summary students who said "I was too immature for college" were classified together with those who made statements like, "I indulged in too many activities till it was too late to do anything about my studies".

These groups were combined because the overindulgence usually referred to manifestations of immaturity, namely an unrealistic assessment of time, energy, interests, etc.

Most usually the overindulgence was in informal social activities, such as spending time with friends, bull sessions, cards, pool, etc., and only occasionally was it in formal extra-curricular activities.

The second source of data regarding reasons for dropping out was the check-list at the end of the questionnaire. The results here are very similar to those already discussed (Tables V, VI). Of the three categories of reasons used (Academic, Personal and Circumstances) the largest proportion of items checked by all dropouts was in the "Academic" category. For both failing dropouts and those in good standing, "difficulty in keeping up studying", "not working hard enough" and "lack of interest" are checked most often. The second largest proportion are the items checked in the "Personal" category. Here the emphasis was on "not sure what I wanted to do in life", and "too involved with friends" or in social activities. The category "Circumstances" contained the fewest items checked. Here the emphasis was on financial difficulty, inadequate housing and change in family circumstance. (The latter included such things as change in financial status, divorce and moving to another part of the country.)

In summary, reasons for dropping out given by male students emphasize the pressure of academic work. Dropouts who fail emphasize factors which can be seen as making the academic pressure intolerable. Primarily, they feel insufficient motivation for college work to be able to deal with the demands of the academic program. Closely related are feelings of isolation, i.e., "feeling like a nobody" in a vast impersonal environment, and lacking the sense of power necessary to cope with it. The urgency of such feelings apparently leads these students to seek relationships among their peers which are excessively time consuming. Considering their high scores on impulse expression, the matter could be put another way. These students are unable to postpone gratification of impulses and to organize their time to satisfy both the academic and the social requirements of their lives.

The dropouts in good standing are another matter. Their stated reasons for dropping out seem to suggest a greater diversity of reasons, academic pressure apparently being one. Some of these students leave for other schools to avoid academic pressure, many going into professional training to do so. Here again lack of motivation for academic training (as opposed to professional training) is involved. For others, the time needed to earn money precludes time for school work. These students drop out, often for only a semester or two, to earn enough money to return. Finally, there are those who are aware of dwindling motivation or of undefined goals, who leave to provide themselves a period of re-assessment.

It would seem that both groups of dropouts have rather similar reasons for dropping out, the two basic ones being reciprocal. That is, demands of academic work are great, and the motivation necessary to meet them is lacking or is diverted to other pursuits (social or financial). The difference, perhaps, between failing dropouts and those in good standing is in terms of the personality characteristics previously discussed. That is, the dropouts in good standing, being more controlled and flexible, are able to assess the potential difficulties in the situation and take positive action before their careers in higher education are threatened by academic failure.

Exceptions to this formulation are 1) some dropouts in good standing who find the academic offerings tedious and unrewarding; 2) those (relatively fewer) students in both groups whose attention and energies are taken up with other kinds of problems in living. Serious physical illness (their own or in the family) or a death in the family, psychiatric problems, emotional involvement with family or with a sweetheart are among those most frequently mentioned.

MALE DROPOUT GROUPS LEAVING AT DIFFERENT TIMES

There is a general tendency for the proportions of failing and in-good-standing dropouts to change in a particular class, as it progresses through 4 years of college. In the beginning the majority of dropouts had failing grades. In the four dropout groups defined in terms of the time of leaving, the proportion of failing dropouts decreased with each successive group (.01 level of significance; see Table VII). Therefore, the characteristics of dropouts and the reasons for dropping out at various points may also be expected to be different.

The four temporally defined groups (DS I, DS II, DS III, DS IV) were compared with each other in terms of the four personality measures. No statistically significant differences were evident either among these four groups or among the subgroups of failing and in-good-standing dropouts contained within them. Each of these temporal groups will be described separately in an effort to characterize their essential features.

DO I (N = 57)[1] left the university either during or at the end of the first semester. Eight of this group were in good standing. In terms of the variables being considered here, this group in good standing may be seen as a very special group of young people. They are high on the Social Maturity Scale (compared to continuing students ($t = 2.27$, $p < .05$)), relatively low on Impulse Expression and Ethnocentrism, and very low on the Authoritarianism Scale ($t = 2.20$, $p < .05$, compared to continuing students, Table VIII). Test items[2] that they check more frequently than the continuing students suggest they espouse a rational, humanistic outlook and a sophisticated interest in intellectual and aesthetic things. They left for a variety of reasons; two to avoid the ROTC program, three because of dissatisfaction with the curriculum, two because of the feelings of isolation they experienced on the Berkeley campus and one because of a death in the family.

Forty-nine of the first DO group were failing at the time they dropped out. These men are slightly higher on the Social Maturity Scale and the Impulse Expression Scale than the continuing students. Furthermore, they are slightly higher on the E and F Scales as well. The items they respond to more often than continuing students suggest a greater degree of emotionality and impulsivity; although there appears to be an interest in intellectual things, lack of organization is a dominant theme and may make academic success difficult. The largest proportion of this group stressed academic pressure and feelings of isolation as the reasons for leaving. They must have experienced these as insuperable difficulties, because they could have obtained permission to continue for at least one semester in an effort to recoup their grades. A number of others in this group stated they lacked motivation or goals to pursue college work further, and several felt they were too immature to be in college. Among other reasons were difficulties with family (including both conflict with and homesickness for), overinvolvement in nonacademic activities, dissatisfaction with the curriculum, financial and health problems. It is interesting to note that 20 percent of the first semester dropouts who were failing, subsequently returned to Berkeley. Almost an equal percentage did not continue schooling elsewhere within the time span of this study. Taken as a whole (failing and in-good-standing students together) this group of dropouts from the first semester has the smallest percentage of returnees to Berkeley and the largest percentage of students who did not continue college elsewhere (at least for the duration of this study).

---

[1] The four groups to be described here represent only that part of the sample for whom a questionnaire, a grade point average and test scores (all three) were available. Therefore the N's tend to be small and may differ from other sample N's presented in the tables.

[2] There are differences in frequencies but these do not exceed chance frequencies. However, where similar items appear in sufficient number to suggest a possible personality characteristic, they have been used to that end.

DO II ($N = 161$) included students dropping out during or at the end of the second and third semesters. One-third of this group were dropouts in good standing. Compared to the continuing students, they are slightly lower on the Social Maturity Scale and Impulse Expression Scale, and significantly higher on the Authoritarianism ($t = 1.72$, $p < .10$) and the Ethnocentrism ($t = 2.03$, $p < .05$) Scales. This pattern of scores as well as the items they choose suggest rigid conventionality, strict morality and an unfavorable self-conception ("undemanding, dull, meek" are some of the items they check about themselves). In general, they appear to be people who do not have much fun in life. Their main reasons for leaving are feelings of isolation, academic pressure, lack of motivation, financial difficulties. A small number of this group left to go on a mission for their fundamentalist church.

The two-thirds of this group who were failing are characterized particularly by a higher mean score on the Impulse Expression Scale than either the group in good standing or the continuing students. Their other scale scores are virtually the same as those of the continuing students. The items they respond to significantly more often than the continuing student reflect their impulsivity and rebelliousness and suggest a charming, carefree, vital kind of person with many varied interests, perhaps too many. The primary reasons they give for leaving are academic failure and academic pressure. Other reasons include lack of motivation, immaturity, financial difficulty, over-indulgence and social isolation. A small number report emotional difficulty and/or psychiatric illness. This dropout group also includes the first individuals who transfer to professional school (one not requiring two years of college), and the first students to report that they left in order to travel abroad or because they wanted a break in their education, having gone to school all their lifetime.

The DO III group ($N = 91$) reverses the proportion of students who are failing to students who are in good standing. Approximately two-thirds of this group, dropping out during or at the end of the fourth semester, were in good standing. Their personality scale scores are essentially the same as those of the continuing students. The items they agree with more often than continuing students suggest that they are less complex and less intellectually oriented than other dropouts, in good standing or failing. They appear to have a positive self-conception (calm, patient, tactful, modest). The largest number give as the reason for leaving transfer to professional school. The next most frequent reasons are financial difficulty and travel abroad (note: not University of California campus abroad). Additionally, some give lack of motivation and others academic pressure as leading to their departure. As usual, there are a number of different reasons, each given by one or two individuals only.

The one-third of this group who were failing are slightly higher on the Impulse Expression Scale and moderately higher on the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism Scales, compared with the continuing students. This combination would suggest conservative, conventional individuals who are unable to control and modify impulses. The items they agree with more often than continuing students also suggest these qualities. The most frequently given reason for their leaving is their inability to deal with the pressure of the academic demands; some see the situation as being "forced" to leave by the University. "Feelings of isolation" is the only other frequently stated reason for leaving. Nevertheless, taken as a whole the DO III group has the largest proportion (33 percent) who return to Berkeley and one of the smallest proportions of students who discontinue their education.

The final group considered, DO IV, is composed of dropouts in the 5th, 6th, and 7th semesters ($N = 103$). Again, two-thirds of them were in good standing and only one-third were failing when they left. The students in good standing have a relatively low score on the Authoritarianism Scale; compared with the continuing students, this difference approaches significance ($t = 1.91, p < .10$). Their mean score on the Ethnocentrism Scale is the same as that of the continuing students, and their scores on Social Maturity and Impulse Expression are moderately higher than the continuing students. There is some similarity in this pattern to the first group described in this section, the dropouts from the first semester who were in good standing. Like the first group they appear somewhat less rigid and conservative and more complex than other dropouts in good standing, and the continuing students as well. The majority of this group gave transfer to professional school as the main reason for leaving. Next most frequent were lack of motivation and financial difficulties. Academic pressure, dissatisfaction with the curriculum, desire for independence, a break in formal educational pursuits and having emotional problems are other reasons given by this group.

The failing dropouts in the 5th, 6th, and 7th semesters represent one-third of this last DO group. They are distinguished by having an Impulse Expression score and an Ethnocentrism score higher than any of the other groups, passing or failing, and significantly higher than the continuing students (IE, $t = 2.38$, $p < .05$; E, $t = 2.84$, $p < .01$). This combination again suggests a fairly immature person, one whose view of the world is likely to be in stereotypes and absolutes and whose integration of impulses is poor. The items they subscribe to more often than other failing dropouts suggest self-interest, a sense of confusion about self-conception, restlessness in behavior, and absolutism and moralism in thinking and values. The most frequently given reasons for leaving include academic pressure (with many again seeing themselves as "forced" to leave) and lack of motivation. A few gave social isolation as the reason even after two years on the campus. Either their needs are insatiable, or their interpersonal techniques are not such as to lead to satisfying social relationships.

Of the dropouts who go on to professional school, the largest proportion come from this fourth group of dropouts (including both students who are in good standing and those who are failing). Of the students who do not continue their education elsewhere, the second largest proportion comes from this fourth dropout group. Unlike the first semester dropouts, who have the largest proportion of the non-continuing students, these students in the last group may have had an opportunity to accomplish what they wished in college. Perhaps, then, they discontinue with some sense of completion.

These brief sketches of the four successive groups of dropouts give some idea of the complexity and variety of attitudes, motivations and other personality factors that combine with situational factors and environmental pressures to determine whether and how long a student remains enrolled in college.

ALL FEMALE DROPOUTS COMPARED WITH FEMALE CONTINUING STUDENTS

Female dropouts, as a total group, are similar to the total male dropout group in scoring significantly higher ($p < .01$ percent) on the Impulse Expression Scale than the continuing female students (Table III). In all, 55 items differentiate the female dropouts from the female continuing students, 12 at the .01 percent level, 23 at the .05 percent level and 20 at the .10 percent level of significance. In general, the dropouts' items suggest that they are conflicted and ambivalent in many areas and that they are aware of these attitudes. Rebelliousness, questioning of convention, conflict with parents, adventurousness, wide interests and a sense of vitality are well represented in the items the dropouts emphasize.

By comparison, the female continuing students subscribe more often to items that suggest conventionality, conformity to authority and duty, denial of impulse and of conflict. A respect for intellectual activities and a moderate ambitiousness are also evident. In general, the differentiation of these two groups is not so clear cut or so well defined by the items as it is in the case of the men.

FEMALE DROPOUTS IN GOOD STANDING

Like their male counterpart, female dropouts in good standing, compared to continuing female students, have a somewhat higher mean score on the Social Maturity Scale (not statistically significant). Unlike the males, their mean score on the Impulse Expression Scale is significantly higher (.01) than that of the continuing female students. Their scores on the E and F Scales are essentially the same as those of continuing students.

In brief, female dropouts in good standing, compared to continuing students, are likely to be characterized by a greater degree of flexibility and especially by a greater awareness of and expression of impulses, feelings and affective experiences. This is borne out by the 58 items which differentiate the two groups (17 items at the .01 percent level of significance, 32 at the .05 percent level and 19 at the .10 percent level of significance). These items reflect much less of the rebelliousness exhibited by male dropouts and instead much more of feelings of restlessness and dissatisfaction:

"At times I have very much wanted to leave home."	.01 percent
"I work under a great deal of tension."	.05 percent
"Often I think that life is absurd."	.05 percent

awareness of conflict and affective moods:

"I have had more than my share of things to worry about."	.01 percent
"My people treat me more like a child than an adult."	.01 percent
"I brood a great deal."	.05 percent

awareness of impulses:

"Many of my dreams are about sex."	.05 percent
"I like to hear risqué stories."	.05 percent

dissatisfaction with self:

"At times I think I am no good at all."	.05 percent
"Bossy, irritable, nagging, possessive."	.01 percent
"Anxious, confused."	.05 percent

In comparison, the continuing female students significantly more often choose items that describe themselves as calm, self-confident, uncomplicated, compliant to authority and as living an orderly and conventional life.

There appears to be a qualitative difference here in comparison with the male dropouts. Female dropouts in good standing differ from comparable men in that they are less rebellious and more open to and accepting of impulses. The female continuing students in contrast to male continuing students are more moderate in their conventionality and ambitiousness.

FEMALE DROPOUTS WHO ARE FAILING

Failing female dropouts have essentially the same scores as continuing students on the Social Maturity and Impulse Expression Scales. However, they have a higher score on both the Authoritarianism Scale (not statistically significant) and on the Ethnocentrism Scale ($p < .05$), suggesting a more primitive level of personality organization than the continuing students (Table III).

The 41 differentiating items (9 at the .01 percent level, 17 at the .05 percent level and 5 at the .10 percent level of confidence) reflect some of this primitiveness, especially an absolutistic kind of thinking:

> "For most questions there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts." (.05 percent)
> "Every person should have complete faith in a supernatural power whose decision he obeys without question." (.10 percent)

There are items that suggest both rebelliousness and compliance with authority:

> "I have often gone against my parents' wishes." (.01 percent)
> "In the final analysis parents generally turn out to be right about things." (.10 percent)

The words used to describe self are also inconsistent:

> "Humorous, loud, submissive." (.05 percent)
> "Managing, meek." (.10 percent)

As in the case of men the items subscribed to more often by the continuing female students emphasize conventionality, compliance with authority and ambitiousness. However these qualities are not so well defined and the differentiation from the dropouts is not so clear cut as in the previous comparisons of male groups.

In general, the female dropouts who are failing are less impulsive than their male counterparts but are like the failing male students in rigidity of attitude and simplicity of personality.

When they are compared on the basis of the personality measures, there is a different relationship among the three female groups than for the male groups. First, the female dropouts in good standing tend to be slightly higher than the two other groups in terms of the Social Maturity Scale. The failing dropouts and the continuing students are virtually the same in their mean scores. Secondly, the dropouts in good standing are highest of the three on the Impulse Expression Scale, being significantly higher than the continuing students (.01 percent) and approaching a significant difference with the failing dropouts (.10 percent). Thus, in terms of these measures, which relate to complexity, autonomy and expressiveness of the personality, the failing dropouts and the continuing students show less evidence of these characteristics.

On the other hand, the other two personality measures suggest the opposite relationship among the three groups. On the Authoritarianism and the Ethnocentrism Scales, the continuing students and dropouts in good standing are similar in mean scores and considerably lower than the failing dropouts. The difference between failing dropouts and dropouts in good standing on the Ethnocentrism Scale approaches significance (.10 percent).

In summary, the failing female dropouts appear to be the least mature, least well developed in personality of the three groups, the continuing students being somewhat intermediate and the dropouts in good standing being the most complex and mature.

REASONS FOR LEAVING GIVEN BY FEMALE STUDENTS

Among the 16 categories of reasons based on the spontaneous responses of students the female dropouts (taken as an entire group) have a different distribution of frequencies than the males. The five reasons most frequently given by female dropouts are:

1. Academic pressure (22.5 percent)
2. Marriage and pregnancy (11.6 percent)
3. Professional school transfer (10.4 percent)
4. Isolation (8.9 percent)
5. Travel or want a break in education (7.8 percent)

Although "Academic pressure" is the most frequently given reason, as it is with the male dropouts, a larger proportion of the males gave it as the primary reason (38.9 percent).

Relatively few women dropouts gave pregnancy as a reason for leaving, and the majority gave marriage as the reason that was tabulated in this category. Nevertheless the marriage and pregnancy category is almost exclusively a female category. A few men stated they left because of marriage, but apparently the new student husband is more likely to continue in school, while the new student wife is more likely to drop out. It is a reasonable conjecture that she becomes the financial support of the new enterprise.

Although the proportions of those giving "transfer to professional school" as the reason for leaving, are different, it is the third most frequently given reason for both female and male dropouts. Females' statements in the questionnaires indicated that they transferred most often to schools of nursing and to pharmacy. Relatively few transferred to medicine and none to law school or optometry.

"Feelings of isolation" is given more frequently by women than by men. The descriptions of experiences and feelings on campus offered by the women who gave this reason are essentially the same as those provided by the men: an awareness of a sense of vastness, great distances between self and others and concomitant feelings of being alone and having little self-worth.

The proportion of women stating they wanted to travel or to take a break in their education is almost twice that of the men giving this reason. It may be that women feel under less pressure of cultural expectations to be constantly working towards an academic goal. On the other hand, this may be a reflection of the very real pressure that men students are under from the threat of military draft.

The five reasons most frequently given by female dropouts in good standing account for 66 percent of that group:

1. Transfer to professional school (18.2 percent)
2. Marriage and pregnancy (14.5 percent)

3. Travel or want a break in education (11.2 percent)
4. Isolation (10.7 percent)
5. Academic pressure (9.3 percent)

It is of interest that the three most frequent reasons (approximately 40 percent of the respondents) involve voluntary actions. The other two imply greater passivity, being acted upon by the external situation or feelings of inadequacy.

In comparison, the female dropouts who were failing stress helplessness in the reasons they give most often. In this respect the failing women dropouts are similar to the failing male dropouts. The reasons given by failing female dropouts are:

1. Academic pressure (54.6 percent)
2. Lack of motivation (7.4 percent)
3. Marriage and pregnancy (6.5 percent)
4. Isolation (4.6 percent)
   Immaturity and overindulgence (4.6 percent)
   Death or illness in family (4.6 percent)
5. Emotional and psychiatric problems (3.7 percent)

Not including two of the three ties for fourth position, this list accounts for approximately 75 percent of the respondents. Only "marriage and pregnancy" and "death or illness in the family" represent active choice of interruption of educational pursuits. The overall ratio of women to men who give death or illness in the family as the primary reason is almost five to one, however. Apparently a woman's education is more susceptible to interruption than a man's.

In summary, the reasons given by women are very similar in kind and in distribution to the reasons given by men. There is perhaps one difference. Apparently women are more likely to drop out in connection with a "caring" function, i.e., marriage, pregnancy, death or illness in the family. How much of this is related to biological and cultural needs and roles and how much is related to a lower set of goals or motivation vis-à-vis higher education is a matter for speculation. Somewhat smaller proportions of women than men give academic pressure and lack of motivation as reasons for leaving, and somewhat larger proportions of women leave to travel or to take a break. Both of these differences suggest that the drive for academic achievement is weaker among women.

Both men and women list academic pressure and feelings of isolation as among the main reasons for the interruption of their education at Berkeley. Dropouts in good standing, of both sexes, convey a sense of choice implicit in their reasons (e.g., professional school), and dropouts who are failing convey an implicit sense of helplessness in their reasons.

In addition, women more often say that they leave: "to gain independence" (2:1); because the Berkeley campus is "too liberal" (2:1); to join a friend of the opposite sex or to be with their family (2:1); because of emotional or psychiatric problems (2:1); and because of physical illness (3:2). These findings support the view that women's education is more easily interrupted.

FEMALE DROPOUT GROUPS LEAVING AT DIFFERENT TIMES

There were no statistically significant differences in the four personality measures among the four temporally differentiated dropout groups, nor among the failing dropouts within these four groups (Table IX). A difference in the Impulse Expression Scale can be noted among the four groups of dropouts in good standing ($F = 4.08$, dr 3, $p < .01$). This difference occurs because the third temporally defined group (DS III) is somewhat lower on the Impulse Expression Scale than the others and the second (DS II) is considerably higher than the others. In order to evaluate this and other differences, the four temporally defined groups of women dropouts and their respective subgroups of failing and in-good-standing students will be described separately in more detail.

The first group of dropouts is somewhat smaller than the others and presents a number of inconsistencies. DO I ($N = 40$) contained a small subgroup of five girls all of whom left so early in the first semester that they had not earned any grades. They appear to be a rather unique group who scored very high on the Social Maturity and the Impulse Expression Scales ($p < .05$ with the other subjects in DO I), and very low on both the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism Scales. Their questionnaires tend to be characterized by verbosity, and a confusion of self-accusation and accusation of someone in the University whom they saw as responsible for their dropping out. Like a very anxious person they experienced difficulties as coming from all directions. Four of them visited the Psychiatric Department of the Student Health Service during their brief stay.

Of the balance of DO I, the first semester dropouts, 15 were in good standing. Compared with continuing students, they are distinguished by a slightly higher score on the Impulse Expression Scale and a slightly lower score on the Authoritarianism Scale. These differences are not statistically significant. The items they respond to more often are suggestive of impulsivity and a diffuse, inconsistent self-concept. Most of this group gave "Isolation" and "Immaturity" as reasons for leaving in the first semester. Two felt that the campus was "too liberal."

The 20 female students who were failing in the first semester also present a rather inconsistent set of personality scale scores and items. Most left because of academic pressure and feelings of isolation and immaturity. Two left because of death or illness in the family; two got married; one joined a boy friend elsewhere. One felt the campus was "too liberal."

The follow-up of this first semester dropout group indicates that 59 percent continued in college elsewhere and 29 percent discontinued school after dropping out. Eight percent returned to Berkeley during the time of the study.

DO II ($N = 123$), female students dropping out in the second and third semesters, included 44 who were in good standing. This latter group is the most clearly differentiated, of all the female DO subgroups, from the continuing students. Students in this group have significantly higher scores on the Impulse Expression Scale ($p < .01$) and on the Social Maturity Scale ($p < .05$). They are also lower than the continuing students on both the Ethnocentrism and the Authoritarianism Scales. Thus, they may be characterized as relatively more complex, rational, tolerant, and free in their affective functioning. The items they subscribe to more frequently do not stress rebelliousness so much as reasoned independence of judgment regarding social, moral and religious values, and a dissapproval of absolute authority. Awareness of a variety of feelings, positive and negative, including alienation and immobilization is indicated. Finally, strong positive attitudes toward intellectual interests and skills are expressed. Items that are emphasized in self-description include: "anxious, confused, emotional, high strung, interests wide, irritable, unstable" (.05 percent); "demanding, disorganized, snobbish, argumentative" (.10 percent).

The reasons for leaving given by this group are characterized by diversity rather than emphasis on a few reasons. Almost equal numbers of these dropouts give the following reasons: academic pressure, isolation, lack of motivation, financial difficulties, joining a boyfriend, girl friend or own family, and demand of family (i.e. that the student leave Berkeley because she was not thought to be behaving according to family standards). Smaller numbers gave these reasons: transfer to professional school, death or illness in family, physical illness, travel or study abroad, marriage, dissatisfaction with curriculum. There were also a number of other reasons given only once. In all, they seem like a vigorous, energetic, involved group of young women with much going on in their lives.

The females who were failing and dropped out during this same period, i.e., second and third semester ($N = 68$), are a very different group. Where their fellow dropouts in good standing could be seen as a group of complicated, expressive women, the failing female dropouts were markedly constricted, rigid and conforming. Compared to the continuing students, the failing dropouts have significantly higher scores on both the Authoritarianism ($p < .05$) and the Ethnocentrism ($p < .01$) Scales. Their scores on the other two scales are essentially the same as the continuing students. The items they subscribe to more often than continuing students reflect a mixture: impulsive wishes, skepticism about people, anti-intellectualism, some interest in science, submission to authority and feelings of uncertainty and lack of confidence in self.

Most of this group gave academic pressure as the reason for leaving Berkeley. Slightly more than half of them recognized their own inability to cope with the academic program, and slightly less than half of them blamed the University or some member of it for their having to leave. Among other reasons were a few reports of financial difficulties and marriage.

Taken as a whole, the female dropouts (failing and in good standing) who left during the second and third semesters have the highest proportion (of any of the female dropout groups) of students who continue in some form of academic education. Thus 77 percent continued in school, 25 percent returned to Berkeley, and 52 percent went to other colleges, universities, and other University of California campuses. Only 18 percent of the entire DO II female group discontinued schooling completely during the time of this study.

DO III (N = 90, the females leaving during or at the end of the fourth semester) shows a sharp decrease in the proportion of failing dropouts. As a whole the group showed somewhat less variance in their personality scale scores compared to the other DO groups ($p < .10$). The largest proportion of this group, the students in good standing, show no appreciable difference in scale scores from the continuing students. They may be considered as relatively conventional, dutiful, and optimistic. The items they subscribe to more often than continuing students and other dropouts in good standing emphasize dutifulness and socially approved behavior (like not drinking heavily). Adjectives used to describe self are "stable, well groomed, homely, submissive, passive."

One-third of this group indicated they left to go to professional schools, such as nursing, dental hygiene and physical therapy. The next largest proportion of them (about 1/6th) got married or joined a boy somewhere else. Another sixth wanted a break in their education or left to travel abroad. The rest emphasized academic pressure, isolation, lack of money and a variety of other reasons.

The failing students in this group are distinguished from the continuing students as well as the dropouts in good standing primarily by a high score on the Impulse Expression Scale. These findings suggest women who are conventional but who tend to have difficulty in managing impulses, whether on the level of fantasy or overt behavior. The items they subscribe to more often than continuing students and other female failing dropouts indicate a person with some intellectual interests who feels restless, disorganized and impatient and who enjoys such activities as flirting. Self-regard is not high. They describe themselves as "irritable, disorganized, unstable." Half of this group left because of academic pressure, most of them tending to blame the University for their difficulty.

Of this entire group of women dropouts leaving during or at the end of the fourth semester (DO III), 24 percent returned to Berkeley, 29 percent continued in other four-year colleges and 33 percent went on in professional training. Compared to the previous two dropout groups, this represents a sharp increase in the proportion changing from academic to professional training.

DO IV (N = 69, female dropouts in the fifth, sixth, and seventh semester) again has a small proportion of failing dropouts. The entire group is distinguished from continuing students by a slightly higher score on the Social Maturity Scale and a considerably higher score on the Impulse Expression Scale. Thus they may be regarded as somewhat more complex, more independent in their functioning and more aware of and expressive of impulse and affect.

The dropouts in good standing in this last group have a similar pattern of scores and may be described in much the same way. In addition, the dropouts in good standing, compared with students who continue at Berkeley, subscribe to items that suggest the following characteristics: rebelliousness and difficulty in controlling and integrating impulses and behavior. They apparently feel anxious, excitable and changeable. They tend to feel confused about themselves.

Most of these dropouts in good standing state they left because of marriage or pregnancy. The next largest number transferred to professional school, and the next describe themselves as lacking in motivation to continue college work. As with other groups high on the Impulse Expression Scale, there tends to be a greater variety of reasons for leaving given by this group: academic pressure, isolation, wish for independence, psychiatric illness, travel abroad, joining a boy friend elsewhere, desiring a break in education and dissatisfied with the curriculum are among those mentioned by more than one person.

The failing dropouts in this final group have a somewhat lower Impulse Expression Scale score than the in-good-standing group. Most of them stated they left because of their own academic insufficiency, although a few blamed the University or its officials for not being able to continue. A few gave "Emotional Difficulties" as a reason for leaving, and a few listed marriage.

With the exception of the first semester female dropouts, the smallest proportion of students returning to Berkeley is in this last (DO IV) dropout group (20 percent). Similar to the first semester dropouts, this final group includes the largest proportion (compared to DO II and DO III) of students discontinuing their higher education for at least the period of this study (12 to 18 months). Thirty one percent of the students discontinue at this point; almost as many go on to other colleges and other UC campuses (32 percent).

FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Follow-up data were obtained from approximately 68 percent of the dropouts who had returned questionnaires in the groups DO I, DO II and DO III. The same data were available from all the DO IV subjects on their original questionnaire. Except for those in the DO IV group who dropped out in the 7th semester, these data were obtained 12 to 18 months following dropout from Berkeley. This made possible a determination of the post-dropout educational status of each student who responded. The educational classifications upon which comparisons are based are the following:

1. Registered at the University of California, Berkeley. Students were considered registered if, at the time the information was obtained, they were either enrolled in the current semester or in the previous spring semester, if information was obtained during the summer.

2. Registered at any academic institution other than the University of California, Berkeley. Educational status 2 is divided into the following subgroups:

   2A. Registered at a university or college excluding junior colleges, California State colleges and all University of California campuses.

2B. Registered at a junior college in California.

2C. Registered at a State College in California.

2D. Registered at a University of California campus other than Berkeley.

3. Registered at a professional school, i.e., schools of medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing, physical therapy.

4. Registered at a technical (e.g., electronics) or vocational (e.g., secretarial) school.

5. Not registered in any of the schools covered by the above categories. In other words, not in school.

Of the sample responding to follow-up requests, 21 percent of female and 24 percent of the male dropouts reporting belong in category 1. In other words, they return to Berkeley. Between 41 percent (female) and 49 percent (male) go on to other University of California campuses, other universities, state and junior colleges. Between 9 percent (male) and 13 percent (female) go on to professional schools. Two percent (male) to 3 percent (female) go to technical school. Only 17 percent of the men and 22 percent of the women dropouts in this study appear to have actually dropped out of higher education as of a year to a year and a half after leaving Berkeley. Or, to put it the other way, 62 percent of the women and 73 percent of the men dropouts were continuing their academic studies 12 to 18 months after leaving Berkeley (Table XIV).

The dropouts, male and female, who return to Berkeley, score relatively high on the Social Maturity and Impulse Expression Scales and relatively low on Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism, compared with dropouts in the other educational categories (Tables X, XI). Their scores are sufficiently distinctive to permit the following description. They are likely to be flexible, realistic, humane and tolerant of others; they value sensations, have an active imagination and are likely to be interested in intellectual and aesthetic pursuits. The dropouts who report that they are not continuing in any school (category 5) have scores on the Social Maturity Scale and the Impulse Expression Scale that are very similar to those of the group who return to Berkeley. However, these dropouts - the only dropouts who fully deserve the term - have slightly higher scores on the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism Scales, suggesting somewhat less flexibility and complexity in their personality than the group returning to Berkeley.

Dropouts continuing at other institutions of higher learning have a more moderate. intermediate position on these scales compared with the two groups just described (i.e., lower on Social Maturity and Impulse Expression and higher on Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism). They are similar to the students who continue uninterruptedly at Berkeley. That is, they are likely to be more conservative, compliant to authority, task oriented and less tolerant of others.

The most discrepant single group are the students who leave Berkeley to go on to professional schools. In terms of their personality scale scores they may be described as rather rigid, inhibited, dependent on authority and convention, and intolerant of differences and ambiguities. This is the case for both the men and the women in this group. Approximately half of the dropouts in this group - i.e., going to professional school - left Berkeley at the end of the fourth semester. As stated earlier, many of these students indicated they had planned an academic field of study initially but changed to professional school after experiencing some difficulty or dissatisfaction at Berkeley. The other half transferred some time during the last two years at Berkeley.

Students with a grade point average below 2.0 almost never go on to professional schools. However, such students (with low grade point averages) continue with academic studies at about the same rate as those with a GPA above 2.0 (Table XII). Grade point average is not a significant factor in determining whether or not a dropout continues in higher education.

Students with a low grade point average are likely to continue at a junior college or a state college (70 to 75 percent of the students with a GPA less than 2.0 went to junior and state colleges). Many students apparently are able to transfer to other University of California campuses and other four year colleges and universities in spite of "going down" in grade points at Berkeley. Substantial proportions of the dropouts with GPAs above 2.0 go on to state colleges, and a few transfer to junior colleges. Many students in the latter group are those who, according to their questionnaires, found the academic pressure at Berkeley and the sense of personal isolation too great and sought instead a small campus, where more social contact is possible without special effort and where a more personal interest is possible on the part of the teaching staff. Some of these students stated they preferred the smaller college because it permitted them to live at home.

A larger proportion of men (60 percent) than women tend to fall below a 2.0 GPA before dropping out (apparently they persist longer even though having difficulty), with the result that significantly more of them continue at the junior college level (Table XIII). Fewer women (40 percent) continue at Berkeley until they drop below 2.0, and comparatively fewer transfer to the junior colleges.

Time of dropping out is related to the type of institution in which further education is pursued. A comparatively small proportion of first semester dropouts return to Berkeley. Also, a comparatively large proportion of them have not resumed schooling a year later (Table XV). Perhaps they had very minimal motivation for higher education, or perhaps they were affected by their failure in such a way as to dissuade them from additional education. The personality measures obtained for both the men and women suggest that the majority of the first semester dropouts who are unable to obtain passing grades are very immature in personality development.

Whatever the case may be, there appears to be a general tendency for maximum utilization of junior colleges by early dropouts (i.e., in the first three semesters). On the other hand, later dropouts (semesters 4, 5, 6 and 7) tend to transfer to state colleges and other University of California campuses. It seems probable that this pattern is related to the fact that higher proportions of the early dropouts are failing, and in order to continue in school they must attend a junior college or a state college. After two years at Berkeley the junior college is no longer a possibility for continuation. Furthermore, the later dropouts include larger proportions of students in good standing; they are able to transfer to other four-year colleges and other University of California campuses.

Attendance at four year schools not administered by the State of California appears to be unrelated to time of dropouts (Table XVI).

Failing in college is often thought to be a crushing experience for a student, one that may damage his self-esteem seriously. It is interesting to note, however, that failing does not seem to discourage many students from going on in some form of higher education. The numbers of failing dropouts who discontinue school and the number of dropouts in good standing who discontinue school are not appreciably different.

A substantial proportion of so-called dropouts are dropouts only from the campus of original registration; many dropouts return to that campus after an interruption, and many others go on with their higher education at other colleges and universities. Furthermore, such continuation does not necessarily depend on academic success at the initial campus. Failure at the initial campus is not significantly related to continuation of education, but failure together with time of dropout are related to the type of institution in which the student is likely to continue.

Personality factors appear to be related both to dropping out and to type of continuation after leaving the original campus. Students who return to the original campus are an unusually mature group with a high level of complexity at the time they first enter the University. Students who are "true" dropouts are somewhat less mature, less complex and less flexible. Students who drop out from Berkeley and continue their higher education elsewhere resemble the students who never leave Berkeley in relatively greater conventionality, control and compliance to authority. Finally, students going into professional training are, at the time of original entrance at Berkeley, the group which is most rigid, inhibited and compliant to authority.

QUALITATIVE OBSERVATIONS

In attempting to assess the questionnaire data and to develop categories for handling them, it was necessary to read through and evaluate nearly one thousand questionnaires. It was necessary, for example, to read all the questionnaires sequentially, that is, beginning with the earliest dropouts and progressing through the successive semesters to the end of the 7th semester, in order to classify the reasons for entering Berkeley and for leaving. The impressions obtained in this process gave an over-view of the dropout that is not readily available from the quantitative data.

A consistent impression that emerged from this over-view was that dropping out of college can be closely related to a conflict about autonomy and that dropping out can be in part an expression of development of autonomy in the students who withdraw. Often the dropout seems to be questioning his values. He appears to be attempting to define what his values are and what he wants to do, as opposed to unexamined compliance with the values - implicit or explicit - of parent, friends, school or society. Sometimes this goes on clearly in the awareness of the student; sometimes it appears to be going on at a level of action without any awareness on the part of the student.

This is evident even among the earliest dropouts, some of whom, for example, left to avoid the military training that was required at Berkeley at that time. Dropouts from the second and third semester manifest more clearly a wish to examine unexamined values and to establish what values they wish to hold. Many dropouts were quite vague in their reasons for coming to college or indicated that they came because it was expected of them. But even if they had quite specific goals - as most did - their questionnaires imply that they began to wonder, by the end of the second semester, why they were doing what they were doing. In the third and fourth semester this becomes increasingly evident and is still manifest even as late as the sixth semester. In other words, some students seem to reach this point early and some later.

There is much variation in the level of awareness of this desire to question and to examine values, and it tends to be expressed in many different ways and in varying degrees of explicitness. Thus, some say, "It was time to reassess" or it was "time for a change". Some feel they were not learning enough and wanted to get away from school for a while to re-evaluate their motivations. One student put it that he left in order "to raise Hell and come back more serious", while others said, "I was not sure what I wanted to do in life". Some students state explicitly that they leave because they want to be independent. A common attitude is illustrated by one boy in good standing who gave a number of practical (though not compelling) reasons for leaving Berkeley and added, "I thought it might be a nice experience to get away from home and the family for a while." He went to a four year college in another state. A very articulate statement of the matter was made by a boy with a GPA of 3.176: "Decided I needed work experience. Needed to prove to myself I could hold a job. Wanted some time to think about past experiences, to read, to meet some people who had gone to work immediately after high school, to meet some people who had completed college and then gone to work, to experience a small college..."

It is evident in the questionnaires that many of the students who go abroad on their own are using it partly as a period for a similar re-evaluation. Some questionnaires only imply this, some are quite explicit. Thus a girl with a 2.55 GPA stated: "Wanted a junior year abroad and just a year away from college to straighten out the long term projects that one doesn't have time to think about when one is in the midst of the academic year." It seems possible that the students who arrange to go to University of California campuses abroad may use that period for the same purpose, although they do not appear to think of themselves as going abroad for that reason.

The apogee of this restlessness seems to be reached in the fifth semester, when larger numbers of dropouts make statements to the effect that they are tired of studying, not sure what they are studying for or want to take time out. Often at this time they get involved in other pursuits, such as boy friends or girl friends. This restlessness is often a component of transfer to other colleges, of a work-study program, or of going to campuses abroad.

The questionnaires of some students suggested that they are on the other side of the matter. That is, rather than rebel against the values of their parents, which were instrumental in persuading them to come to college, they appear instead to turn away from the inducement to rebel which seems to them ever present in their college peers; in other words, they seem to retreat from the possibilities of re-examining their values and instead return to their family home to continue their education at a local junior college or state college. Among them are those who described the Berkeley campus to be "too liberal."

The search for autonomy disrupts the educational plane of the individual student in varying ways. As already mentioned, some students take time out to do other things not related to academic work, while others manage an interruption in their stay at Berkeley by means of the foreign campus program, work-study program or by temporary transfer to another college.

The questionnaires of many failing dropouts show clearly that their academic failure represents an implicit questioning of the values of college education. Passive resistance to work or other forms of work-immobilization are common, and over-involvement in non-academic activities and obvious, conscious ignoring of academic responsibilities abound. Failing students often state they were aware of ignoring their academic responsibilities but seemed unable to do anything about it until it was too late. Often they indicate that they were aware of resources on campus they might have turned to for assistance but did not do so.[1] In filling out the questionnaire some months after dismissal or dropout some students indicate that they have become aware of conflicts of autonomy. One student stated: "I needed this dismissal to wake me up and give me a chance to reassert the values and goals which were always a part of my life." Variations of this are frequent. The establishment of autonomy does not necessarily involve the overthrow of previously accepted values but instead a re-examination of them and a decision as to which ones the student wants to make his own.

---

[1] It could be plausibly argued, of course, that academic failure is due to lack of intellectual powers. This no doubt is true in some instances, although the extremely high admission standards (which included the upper 10 percent of California high school graduates in the case of the present population) would argue against many such possibilities.

For some students, of course, the questioning is so difficult that it seems to necessitate a complete revolution or upheaval in order to be accomplished at all. Among these are the ones who flunk irretrievably (some flunk more than once), who marry hastily, become pregnant, and the like.

It is interesting that many of the failing and in-good-standing students who leave complaining of the pressure and the impersonality at Berkeley nevertheless have clearly defined plans for returning to Berkeley either to graduate or in order to do graduate work. It is as though the complaints are an external reason which they have to give themselves in order to go away and return by their own choice. A frequent comment in the questionnaires is to the effect that "the experience" or the subsequent months out of school matured them and they now feel ready to return and to work.

Observers of the adolescent period of life who look at it in relation to the rest of society feel that the adolescent is like an editor. He weighs and sifts and culture's values, discarding some and choosing to retain others that appear to have relevance to life from his perspective. One dropout from Berkeley who was interviewed, on his return, in connection with another study said, "I found that, first, you have to decide whether you want to live. Then, you have to decide what you want to be." Much of the dropout phenomenon seems to involve just such vital questions.

The variations of this theme of editing or seeking of autonomy - i.e., the differences in timing of the efforts, the differences in the degree of awareness of the process or struggle going on, and the differences in what manner it is done and how overtly - all these variations clearly indicate that many other important personality variables not included in this study may be highly relevant to understanding dropouts from college.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results that have been described in the preceding sections will be summarized in terms of the specific objectives of this study, as set forth earlier in this report.

1) The first objective was to determine whether students who drop out from college can be shown to have some measurable personality characteristics which differentiate them from students who remain in college. The consistent difference that has been found between the two groups in this study is in the dimension of personality measured by the Impulse Expression Scale. Both men and women dropouts, as a total group, compared to students who do not drop out, have significantly higher mean scores on that measure. In general, then, the dropout at Berkeley is likely

to be characterized at the time of his entrance, by ascendance in social relations and by enjoyment of fantasy and imagination. He values experiences and sensations, and his actions are determined more by personal feelings and inclinations than by objective conditions.

Male dropouts are characterized by independence and rebelliousness and by conflict with their families, with authority and with convention. They are adventurous both in terms of physical activity and in the realm of ideas, and they express interest in intellectual pursuits. They feel somewhat confused and are aware of having difficulty in functioning.

Women dropouts demonstrate awareness of conflict and of ambivalence. They are also rebellious, questioning of conventional attitudes, and adventurous. They have wide interests and tend to value sensation.

By comparison, continuing students at time of entrance are more conventional and submissive to authority and more dutiful. They suppress impulses and conflict, and they are more orderly, organized and ambitious.

2) The second objective was to determine whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out when they are failing and students who drop out while in good standing. Again the dimension of impulse expression is relevant. Male dropouts who are failing at the time they drop out have a significantly higher mean score on the Impulse Expression Scale than both the students who do not drop out and the dropouts in good standing. Both the items they subscribe to more often and a significantly higher mean score on the Ethnocentrism Scale suggest that the failing dropout is relatively immature in his personality development. He is likely to be undisciplined. He has poor control over his impulses. His thinking is over-simplified and stereotyped. His counterpart, the female dropout who is failing, is also likely to be immature in personality development, but she is characterized by being a constricted person who does not experience conflicts based on impulsivity. The failing female dropout group has scores that are similar to the continuing students with the exception of a significantly higher score on the Ethnocentrism Scale.

In comparison to the failing dropouts, the dropouts in good standing tend to be more mature. Both men and women have relatively lower scores on the Ethnocentrism and Authoritarianism Scales, indicating relatively greater sophistication, complexity and personal freedom than the other dropout groups and the continuing students. In addition the male dropouts in good standing have a mean score on the Social Maturity Scale which, in comparison with continuing students, approaches a significant difference. The female dropouts in good standing have a significantly higher score than the continuing students on the Impulse Expression Scale. The other scale scores and their item preferences suggest that this does not represent an impulse-ridden quality as characterizes the failing male dropouts. Rather it signifies a relative freedom to experience impulses, sensations and feelings such that would contribute to imaginativeness.

3) The third objective was to determine whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out at different times in their college career. No systematic differences were found among the four dropout groups representing different lengths of stay in college before dropping out. The few statistically significant differences in mean scores on the personality scales seem not related to time of dropping out or to other variables included in this study. The only systematic change observed in relation to the time dimension is the change in proportion of passing and failing dropouts in successive time periods. That is, there are more failing dropouts in the earlier semesters and more dropouts in good standing in the later semesters. What relationship this bears to personality factors is not evident in the analysis of the present data.

4, 5) Results bearing on the fourth and fifth objectives will be summarized simultaneously. The fourth objective was to determine whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who drop out of college and then continue their educational pursuits and those who do not continue. The fifth objective was to determine whether measurable personality characteristics differentiate students who, after dropping out, continue in different kinds of educational settings.

Dropouts who reported within a year to 18 months of dropping out that they were not registered in school had a pattern of personality scores that suggest that they value sensations, enjoy fantasy and imagination and are motivated by rebellious feelings. At the same time they appear to lack flexibility and complexity in their personality makeup at the time they enter college.

The most mature group of all are the students who drop out and return to Berkeley. They are complex, flexible, realistic people who are humane and tolerant of others, who value sensation and variety of experience and who have an active imagination and high intellectual and esthetic interests.

The students who do not drop out from Berkeley and those who drop out and then continue elsewhere tend to be similar to each other. They have personality scale scores that suggest that they are somewhat less mature than the other two groups. They are more conservative, conventional, compliant to authority, task-oriented and ambitious at the time that they first register at college.

The single most discrepant group are the students who leave Berkeley to go on to professional schools. Their personality measures suggest a description as : rigid, inhibited, dependent on authority and on convention, and intolerant of differences and ambiguities.

6) The final objective was to determine what positive or negative values (relative to personality development) can be demonstrated in the dropout's college experience. Evaluation of the questionnaires led to the impression that dropping out of college frequently is related to conflicts involving establishment of autonomy. Many students stated

explicitly that their purpose in leaving Berkeley was to clarify their values and their purposes and goals in higher education. In the case of many others who stated it less explicitly, it was possible to infer a similar process. Furthermore, statements by students who dropped out because of academic failure sometimes indicated that they were rebelling against externally imposed values. By conscious or near-conscious involvments in non-academic activities and in other ways they were seeking dismissal for academic reasons. Whether it is a conscious or unconscious choice, dropping out of college for many students represents a move towards autonomy, an effort to establish for themselves the values and goals of a higher education and to make college, or non-college, a matter of their own choice.

Previous studies of the college freshman have characterized him as having essentially an authoritarian personality at the time he arrives at college: "It is a pattern in which strong impulses are directly opposed by an alert, rigid, and punitive conscience. The ego has to devote so much energy to restraining impulses that its other functions are not well performed; it has been able to integrate little of the primitive conscience with itself, so that the latter continues to function more or less as a foreign body. This state of affairs at the core of the personality is reflected at the surface in characteristics ways: in stereotyped thinking, intolerance of ambiguity, punitive morality, submissiveness toward the powerful and dominance toward the weak, conventionality, anti-intellectualism, hostility toward people perceived to be different from oneself." (8) This personality profile is essentially the profile of the continuing students in the present study. Compared to them, men and women dropouts who left in good standing were seen to be more mature in a variety of ways. Their impulse life has been integrated with ego functioning and their conscience is more humanized and tolerant.

In other words, it is possible to see the dropout who leaves in good standing as being, in a sense, too mature and complex to be able to accept readily the position of docility necessary, on the part of freshman, to fit into the educational program at Berkeley. He may also be seen as needing more diverse experience than lower division education at Berkeley can provide in order to satisfy his intellectual curiosity and imagination. Furthermore, he may need to have opportunity for more autonomy and more responsibility than the organization of lower division classes can allow. In short, it seems very likely that many dropouts in good standing leave Berkeley to satisfy these kinds of needs. Probably many of them are those who return to Berkeley to flourish at the upper division and graduate levels. If it is deemed desirable that these students remain at Berkeley, a lower division plan with more options providing for these kinds of needs seems necessary.

Where the dropout who leaves in good standing seems too mature, as it were, the failing dropout seems not to have matured or developed enough to be able to meet the demands of the educational program.

The girl who fails and drops out possesses an even more rigid, punitive conscience than that of the typical "authoritarian" freshman.

Her conscience is so constricting that her possibilities for perceiving and making choices are very limited. Such demands as her conscience imposes set severe limits on her capicity to experience new situations, and she is unable to use effectively what talent she may have. Her need is for experiences that will modify these strictures on her personality. Such experiences may be available in the classroom, where the possibility of conflicting ideas, of ambiguities, of creative impulse without anxiety, are examined by a professor, whose behavior, while representing the authority, provides a model of tolerance for these things which she may identify with. They may be available also in living with a variety of other students. But their availability may be limited by the fact of very large classes where the teacher as a model is less readily perceived, and especially by the fact of having to maintain a grade point average under great constraint and in competition with more freely functioning students. If this dropout is to be retained, she will have to be given more time to free herself and more opportunity to experience, unthreateningly, the freedom of others, especially teachers.

The boy who fails and drops out appears to be faced with a more complex problem. His conscience is strict and thereby limits his possibilities, but it is not so all-encompassing as in the case of failing girls. He is partially controlled by his impulses without being able to put them to use for his own chosen purposes. His ego is not mature enough to modify, to postpone, or to choose when to gratify his impulses. In other words where the female failing dropout is very limited in her possibilities for action, he is unable to choose not to act. He too needs to experience directly the qualities of a rational conscience and a rational ego as well. Again, the teacher as model and support or the experience of a variety of peers in small discussion sections seem likely possibilities for such experience. As with the girl, the boy who fails needs more time and more opportunity to have these kinds of experiences. Perhaps both of them would be more apt to get such experiences in well defined and structured study groups that remain together and with the same teacher over a longer period of time than is afforded by the usual one semester class.

Perhaps the failing dropout is not ready for college, as it is now constituted at Berkeley. And conversely, perhaps, the college as it is now constituted, is not ready for the dropout who leaves in good standing. The latter choose to leave for various reasons, an effort to establish their autonomy perhaps being basic. The former leave because they have to and in doing so, many of them are moving on into educational programs such as junior colleges where it may be more possible for them to mature.

A final word about the dropouts' attempt to establish autonomy. The hypothesis that many dropouts are seeking autonomy with respect to choice of values and life-goals could bring together many of the variety of reasons for dropping out which abound in the literature and which represent a miscellany that is difficult to integrate. The student who perceives himself as having to drop out for one of the myriad of reasons usually given - financial difficulty, a girl or boy friend, ill health in the family, inadequate housing, dissatisfaction with curriculum, or the many reasons for flunking out - may indeed be seen as seeking, at another level of awareness a "time out" from something he entered without question so that he can determine what his own choices are. This hypothesis does not assume that it is necessary for the student to be aware of his conflict, his questioning or his efforts at autonomy. Nor does it assume that the student achieves insight in the process and necessarily completes it with well integrated values and interests.

Such a hypothesis about the dropout, of course, raises questions about similar processes in the continuing student. He is more receptive, more compliant to authority. He is learning what is expected of him, and he is maintaining his grades at an adequate level to continue uninterruptedly in college. In this way he presumably finds some means with which to "edit" his values. This may be within the academic program, or it may be largely in associations outside the classroom. In the present study, the campus abroad program and the cooperative work-study program both were seen to provide especially good opportunities for re-evaluation. The fact that such re-evaluation can and does take place without absence from the campus is shown by other studies (13) which demonstrate that personality change and change in attitudes take place in the four years of college.

In conclusion it is becoming increasingly apparent (3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that the college dropout phenomenon is not nearly so alarming or catastrophic as it is frequently thought to be. That is, the proportions of dropouts who are continuing a program of higher education suggest that the classic figure of 50 percent dropout rate is unrealistic and misleading. It might be nearer the facts to say that 40 percent of the students entering at a given time as freshmen have been continuously registered at that institution four years consecutively. What the other 60 percent do cannot be lumped together under one term such as "dropout"; they pursue diverse paths, the majority in various other institutions of higher learning.

Nevertheless, there should be continuing concern about the dropout from college. Revision of college programs to meet the varied needs of potential dropouts is also likely to aid the development of the non-dropout. Furthermore it is clear from the present study that some dropouts have achieved a very high level of development by the time of college entrance. They are just the kind of people who make a college interesting and stimulating both for teachers and other students.

Further research on personality characteristics of dropouts should recognize the variety of psychological subgroups that are represented and should include personality measures and other more individual assessments at the time of dropping out. Such research should also include more comparable information about the continuing students. Both kinds of data could provide further clarification of the personality factors that have emerged in this study.

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, Daniel, Sanford, R. Nevitt, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper & Bros., 1950, 990 pp.

2. Center for the Study of Higher Education, Omnibus Personality Inventory - Research Manual, University of California, Berkeley, 1962.

3. Eckland, Bruce C. and Smith, Anita C., "A Follow-up Survey of Male Members of the Freshman Class of the University of Illinois in September 1952." Report No. 105, Office of Institutional Research, University of Illinois, May, 1964.

4. Iffert, Robert E., and Clarke, Berry S., "College Applicants, Entrants, Dropouts." U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin No. 29, 1965.

5. Knoell, Dorothy. "Institutional research on retention and withdrawal," Institutional Research on Students. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1961.

6. Knoell, Dorothy. "Needed research on college dropouts," paper presented at the National Research Conference on College Dropouts. Gatlinburg, Tenn., Aug. 24, 1964.

7. Pervin, Lawrence A., Identification, identity and the college dropout. J. American College Health Association, Vol. 14, No. 3. pp. 158-164.

8. Sanford, Nevitt. "Developmental Status of the Entering Freshman," in The American College (N. Sanford, Ed.) New York, John Wiley and Sons. 1962. pp. 253-282.

9. Sanford, Nevitt. Self and Society. New York. Atherton Press. 1966.

10. Sexton, Virginia S., Factors contributing to attrition in college populations: twenty-five years of research. J. General Psychology, 1965, 72, 301-326.

11. Summerskill, John. "Dropouts from College," in The American College (ed. by Nevitt Sanford). New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1962. pp. 627-657.

12. Webster, Harold. Some quantitative results. In Sanford, N. (Ed.) Personality development during the college years. J. Soc. Issues. 1956, 12, 29-43.

13. Webster, Harold; Freedman, Mervin; and Heist, Paul, "Personality Changes in College Students," in The American College (ed. by Nevitt Sanford). New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1962. pp. 811-846.

TABLE A1

Male Dropouts Who Took Personality Tests vs. Male Dropouts Who Did Not Take Personality Tests, Compared by Grade Point Average

Grade Average	2.0	2.0	Unknown	Totals
With tests	95	110	22	227
Without tests	92	101	23	216

df = 2 $x^2 = 0.142$ $P < .99 > .98$

Female Dropouts Who Took Personality Tests vs. Female Dropouts Who Did Not Take Personality Tests, Compared by Grade Point Average

Grade Average	2.0	2.0	Unknown	Totals
With tests	112	54	12	178
Without tests	86	35	15	136

df = 2 $x^2 = 3.19$ $P < .30 > .20$

TABLE A2

Male Dropouts With Personality Tests vs. Male Dropouts Without Personality Tests, Compared by Educational Status

Educational Status	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
With tests	57	96	21	5	48	227
Without tests	57	106	17	2	34	216

df = 4 $x^2 = 4.31$ $P < .50 > .30$

Educational Status	2A	2B	2C	2D	Total 2
With tests	27	20	38	11	96
Without tests	29	35	25	17	106

df = 3 $x^2 = 7.27$ $P < .10 > .05$

Female Dropouts With Personality Tests vs. Male Dropouts Without Personality Tests, Compared by Educational Status

Educational Status	1	2	3	4	5	Totals
With tests	35	75	26	6	36	178
Without tests	31	54	14	4	33	136

df = 4 $x^2 = 1.80$ $P < .80 > .70$

Educational Status	2A	2B	2C	2D	Total 2
With tests	19	11	25	20	75
Without tests	15	6	16	17	54

df = 3 $x^2 = .57$ $P < .95 > .90$

TABLE A3

Males With Questionnaires vs. Males Without Questionnaires, Compared by Personality Test Scores

	Social Maturity Scale (SM)			Impulse Expression Scale (IE)			Fascism Scale (F)			Ethnocentrism Scale (E)		
	X		N	X		N	X		N	X		N
With quest.	84.7	17.9	247	57.3	16.7	247	102.4	21.3	222	51.8	17.3	222
W.O. quest.	87.0	18.6	155	58.2	16.6	155	100.8	22.0	135	49.6	19.3	135
	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$

Females With Questionnaires vs. Females Without Questionnaires, Compared by Personality T Scores

	SM			IE			F			E		
	X		N	X		N	X		N	X		N
With quest.	87.3	19.1	213	52.7	17.5	213	98.0	22.1	177	44.7	16.2	177
W.O. quest.	87.3	17.9	115	51.1	16.2	115	101.0	21.8	104	46.3	15.9	104
	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$	T test		$P>.05$

TABLE A4

Education of Parents of Follow-up Dropout Sample Compared to Education of Parents of 2783 Freshmen entering the University of California at Berkeley in 1959.[1]

		MALES				FEMALES			
		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	
		Fresh men	Drop outs	Fresh men	Drop outs	Fresh men	Drop outs	Fresh men	Drop outs
1	High school or less	40.2%	34.5	48.7%	43.1	34.6%	33.1	41.2%	42.0
2	Started college	18.9%	18.7	22.0%	26.3	20.7%	16.7	28.2%	20.5
3	Finished college	20.3%	25.3	20.2%	23.4	23.3%	28.5	18.7%	27.6
4&5	Graduate or prof. school	19.3%	21.6	7.7 %	7.1	21.4%	21.6	11.0	9.9

---

[1] Data for the freshman group was generously provided by the Center for Study of Higher Education, Dr. Hanon C. Selvin and Dr. Thomas McConnell, Directors.

TABLE A5

Classification of reasons for coming to college given by dropouts responding to a dropout questionnaire.

	Male	Female
1. Specific occupational goal. (job, occupation or career is specified)	15%	15%
2. The means of achieving competence in a particular field is emphasized. (e.g., getting teaching credential, going to medical school)	41%	31%
3. Following a definite interest not connected to a definite job.	4%	5%
4. Personal, internal development.	3%	5%
5. Undefined educational goal. (e.g., college education, finding out what I want to do)	23%	34%
6. Lack of alternatives or because of others' expectations.	14%	10%

TABLE I

Personality Scale - Means and Standard Deviations

	Male Dropouts (N = 392)		Male Controls (N = 469)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Social[1] Maturity	85.9	17.7	83.7	17.6	1.76	.10
Impulse Expression	57.7	16.4	55.4	15.0	2.12	.05
Authoritarianism	101.8	21.5	101.5	20.0	.18	--
Ethnocentrism	51.0	18.1	48.9	16.2	1.66	.10

	Female Dropouts (N = 295)		Female Controls (N = 425)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Social Maturity	87.0	18.5	85.6	19.1	.93	--
Impulse Expression	52.1	16.7	48.7	16.5	2.74	.01
Authoritarianism	99.1	22.0	98.3	21.3	.52	--
Ethnocentrism	45.3	16.1	43.7	14.8	1.28	--

[1] Note: In subsequent tables these four scales will be referred to by their conventional letter designations, as follows:

Social Maturity Scale	SM
Impulse Expression Scale	IE
Authoritarianism Scale	F
Ethnocentrism Scale	E

TABLE II

Personality Scale Means and Standard Deviations

	Male Dropouts Failing (N=214)		Male Continuing Students (N=469)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	85.3	18.6	83.7	17.6	1.06	-
IE	58.8	16.1	55.4	15.0	2.64	.01
F	103.5	22.3	101.5	20.0	1.09	-
E	52.2	19.4	48.9	16.2	2.17	.05

	Male Dropouts In Good Standing (N=178)		Male Continuing Students (N=469)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	86.0	16.9	83.7	17.6	1.83	.10
IE	55.8	17.0	55.4	15.0	-	-
F	99.6	20.9	101.5	20.0	-	-
E	49.8	16.6	48.9	16.2	-	-

	Male Dropouts in Good Standing (N=178)		Male Dropouts Failing (N=214)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	86.0	16.9	85.3	18.6	.40	-
IE	55.8	17.0	58.8	16.1	1.72	.10
F	99.6	20.9	103.5	22.3	1.43	-
E	49.8	16.6	52.2	19.4	1.21	-

TABLE III

Personality Scale Means and Standard Deviations

	Female Dropouts Failing (N=108)		Female Continuing Students (N=425)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	85.4	17.5	85.6	19.1	-	-
IE	49.5	16.6	48.7	16.5	-	-
F	101.6	23.4	98.3	21.3	-	-
E	47.8	16.6	43.7	14.8	2.35	.05

	Female Dropouts In Good Standing (N=168)		Female Continuing Students (N=425			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	87.5	18.4	85.6	19.1	1.11	-
IE	53.0	16.4	48.7	16.5	2.86	.01
F	98.2	20.9	98.3	21.3	-	-
E	44.3	15.6	43.7	14.8	-	-

	Female Dropouts In Good Standing (N=168)		Female Dropouts Failing (N=108)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
SM	87.5	18.4	85.4	17.5	.95	-
IE	53.0	16.4	49.5	16.6	1.70	.10
F	98.2	20.9	101.6	23.4	1.21	-
E	44.3	15.6	47.8	16.6	1.69	.10

TABLE IV

Reasons for Leaving
(Given in % of students)

	Male	Female	Male		Female	
			In good standing	Failing	In good standing	Failing
Academic Pressure and "forced to leave"	38.9%	22.5%	12.4%	60.9%	9.3%	54.6%
("forced to leave only"	(11.1)	(2.6)	-	(21.3)	-	(8.3)
Isolation	6.0	8.9	6.8	5.1	10.7	4.6
Lack of Motivation	13.1	6.6	9.0	15.3	6.1	7.4
Finances	7.1	5.5	13.0	3.1	7.0	1.9
Immaturity and over indulgence	3.8	2.3	1.1	5.5	.9	4.6
Professional school	8.7	10.4	19.8	1.3	18.2	.9
Death or illness of family	1.6	5.2	1.7	1.3	5.1	4.6
Physical illness	2.0	2.9	1.7	.4	1.9	.9
Emotional and psychiatric problems	1.8	3.2	1.7	1.7	2.8	3.7
Travel or want break in education	3.8	7.8	7.9	1.2	11.2	0
Marriage and pregnancy	.2	11.6	0	0	14.5	6.5
				preg:	(2.3)	0
Dissatisfied with curriculum and teaching	4.6	1.7	7.3	2.1	2.3	0
(dissatisfied with teaching only)	(1.3)	(.2)				
Too liberal	.2	1.7	0	0	1.9	1.9
Join boyfriend, girlfriend, or family	1.6	3.5	3.4	0	4.7	1.9
Want to be Independent	1.3	2.0	2.3	0	2.3	1.9
Miscellaneous	5.3	2.2	11.9	1.1	1.1	4.6
	n=450	n=347	n=177	n=235	n=214	n=108

TABLE V

First, Second and Third Most Frequently Checked Reasons for Dropping Out

MALE DROPOUTS

	In Good Standing		Failing
A. Circumstances			
Item #		Item #	
1.	Insufficient finances	1.	Insufficient finances
5.	Changd in family circumstances	5.	Change in family circumstances
2.	Inadequate housing	2.	Inadequate housing
B. Academic			
11.	Didn't work hard enough	11.	Didn't work hard enough
7.	Not interested in the courses taken	9.	Difficulty in keeping up my studying
(9.	Difficulty in keeping up my studying	7.	Not interested in courses taken
(14.	Discouraged by low grades		
C. Personal			
9.	Not sure what I want to do in life	9.	Not sure what I want to do in life
4.	Prefer a smaller college	1.	Got too involved in outside activiti
(2.	Spent too much time having fun	3.	Spent too much time with friends
(7.	Felt lonely, hard to make friends		

FEMALE DROPOUTS

	In Good Standing		Failing
A. Circumstances			
1.	Insufficient finances	8.	Other
6.	Got married or plan to soon	7.	General health
8.	Other	(1.	Insufficient finances
		(6.	Got married, or plan to soon

TABLE V (cont.)

B. Academic

Item #

13. Pressure for grades too great

(9. Difficulty in keeping up my studying
(11. Didn't work hard enough
(14. Discouraged by low grades

5. Not enough help from teacher or T.A.

9. Difficulty in keeping up my studying
11. Didn't work hard enough
13. Pressure for grades too great

C. Personal

9. Not sure what I wanted to do in life
4. Prefer a smaller college
17. Had personal problems

17. Had personal problems
3. Spent too much time with friends
9. Not sure what I wanted to do in life

TABLE VI

Percent of Reasons for Dropping Checked in Each Category of Reason, by Each Kind of Dropout Group.

	Failing				In Good Standing			
DO	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV
Males								
Academic reasons	49	60	56	63	48	46	44	53
Circumstances	16	8	10	9	28	19	21	14
Personal Reasons	35	31	33	28	24	35	36	33
Females								
Academic reasons	38	54	54	61	24	40	44	45
Circumstances	25	13	17	11	24	21	21	22
Personal reasons	37	33	30	28	53	39	35	33

TABLE VII

Successive Proportions of Students Who Dropped Out With Passing Grades.
(Based on 958 students who responded to questionnaire)

MALES

	DO I	DO II	DO III	DO IV	x^2	df	p
%	14	27	59	61	52.3	3	.01

FEMALES

	DO I	DO II	DO III	DO IV	x^2	df	p
%	38	46	83	70	41.3	3	.01

TABLE VIII

Male Dropouts Leaving At Different Times Compared With Male Controls

ALL MALE DROPOUTS

	DO I N=59		DO II N=161		DO III N=91		DO IV N=103		Controls N=469	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	87.7	20.6	84.9	16.4	85.2	17.6	86.6	19.3	83.7	17.6
IE	57.3	16.7	57.6	15.4	55.6	18.0	59.3	16.7	55.4	15.0
F	100.0	26.2	103.7	19.2	102.1	20.4	99.5	23.2	101.5	20.0
E	48.9	19.6	51.7	16.6	50.6	17.6	51.3	19.8	48.9	16.2

IN GOOD STANDING MALES

	DO I N=8		DO II N=51		DO III N=58		DO IV N=61		Controls N=469	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	95.8	14.9	81.6	16.6	85.7	15.7	86.9	20.8	83.7	17.6
IE	52.5	9.3	54.5	16.5	54.8	18.3	58.3	17.7	55.4	15.0
F	84.7	23.0	106.7	18.2	100.6	20.0	95.8	22.2	101.5	20.0
E	40.1	11.9	54.0	15.4	48.7	17.5	48.4	16.7	48.9	16.2

FAILING MALES

	DO I N=49		DO II N=101		DO III N=33		DO IV N=35		Controls N=469	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	86.1	21.5	85.7	16.5	84.4	20.7	85.0	18.4	83.7	17.6
IE	57.5	17.6	58.7	14.7	57.0	17.7	61.7	16.1	55.4	15.0
F	103.2	26.3	102.1	20.1	104.9	21.1	106.5	24.1	101.5	20.0
E	51.1	20.4	50.1	17.5	53.9	17.6	57.7	23.7	48.9	16.2

TABLE IX

FEMALE DROPOUTS LEAVING AT DIFFERENT TIMES COMPARED WITH FEMALE CONTROLS

All Female Dropouts

	DO I		DO II		DO III		DO IV		Controls	
	(N=40)		(N=123)		(N=90)		(N=69)		(N=425)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	89.2	18.4	87.1	19.3	85.1	18.6	90.0	17.3	85.6	19.1
IE	52.3	20.9	52.9	17.6	49.5	14.5	55.3	17.4	48.7	16.5
F	94.0	20.5	100.8	23.3	100.1	20.3	98.0	22.4	98.3	21.3
E	43.4	12.4	46.4	17.1	43.8	15.2	46.2	17.2	43.7	14.8

In Good Standing Female Dropouts

	(N=15)		(N=44)		(N=79)		(N=54)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	83.8	18.0	93.2	17.7	85.3	18.7	88.9	18.5
IE	52.8	19.4	58.3	17.5	49.0	14.7	55.4	17.7
F	95.6	21.6	94.8	18.9	100.2	19.8	99.1	23.9
E	43.8	13.5	42.3	12.9	43.7	15.7	47.0	18.0

Failing Female Dropouts

	(N=20)		(N=68)		(N=9)		(N=11)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
SM	88.3	15.5	83.8	18.9	85.8	17.9	90.3	10.9
IE	46.1	18.7	49.3	16.1	54.9	14.0	52.8	17.4
F	94.9	17.5	104.8	25.4	99.4	25.0	95.9	16.0
E	45.4	10.7	49.5	19.0	44.2	11.4	45.2	14.6

TABLE X

Educational Status by Personality Test Scores, Males Only

Educational Status		1	2	3	4	5		2A	2B	2C	2D	
	Mean	87.3	81.8	72.6		87.1		79.4	79.4	84.6	82.7	
SM	SD	18.3	17.0	20.5		18.1	total	17.9	18.9	17.0	13.0	total
	N	46	94	22	(3)	39	201	26	19	37	11	93
		F = 4.00		$P < .01$					F = 1.94		$P > .05$	
	Mean	58.5	55.7	45.4		58.4		54.8	54.5	57.2	56.1	
IE	SD	16.0	17.0	17.8		16.8	total	17.0	18.2	17.9	12.4	total
	N	46	94	22	(3)	39	201	26	19	37	11	93
		F = 4.7		$P < .01$					F = .66		$P > .05$	
	Mean	96.7	103.2	112.2		101.0		103.5	107.0	99.7	104.6	
F	SD	21.6	19.5	20.4		23.5	total	18.0	21.0	21.2	8.0	total
	N	39	84	20.	(2)	36	179	24	17	33	9	83
		F = 2.42		$P > .05$					F = .966		$P > .05$	
	Mean	48.6	53.2	54.3		52.9		5.36	57.3	51.2	48.3	
E	SD	17.2	17.3	15.8		17.8	total	15.4	18.6	18.7	12.5	total
	N	39	84	20	(2)	36	179	24	17	33	9	83
		F = 1.16		$P > .05$					F = 1.99		$p > .05$	

* Educational status 4 was not included in the variance ratio (F) calculations due to the small size of this group.

TABLE XI

Educational Status by Personality Test Scores, Females Only

ducational tatus		1	2	3	4*	5		2A	2B	2C	2D	
	Mean	89.3	86.9	76.5		90.0		86.5	84.7	86.9	88.7	
M	SD	17.4	19.5	19.2		17.2	total	20.8	19.4	20.3	18.7	total
	N	34	75	26	(8)	33	168	18	13	26	18	75
	F = 2.81		$P < .05 > .01$						F = .16		$P > .05$	
	Mean	55.4	51.8	45.0		56.8		51.7	51.8	50.4	53.8	
E	SD	18.9	15.3	13.5		17.2	total	19.1	16.5	13.5	13.7	total
	N	34	75	26	(8)	33	168	18	13	26	18	75
	F = 2.79		$P < .05 > .01$						F = .628		$P > .05$	
	Mean	96.3	97.0	107.7		97.1		92.4	99.8	101.0	93.9	
F	SD	20.2	23.6	18.3		21.2	total	25.9	20.1	20.6	28.5	total
	N	29	67	19	(6)	27	142	17	12	23	15	67
	F = 1.12		$P > .05$						F = .60		$P > .05$	
	Mean	43.8	46.3	51.1		40.7		46.9	53.9	45.3	41.2	
E	SD	13.3	17.7	16.9		12.5	total	20.8	15.7	15.7	17.9	total
	N	29	67	19	(6)	27	142	17	12	23	15	67
	F = 1.78		$P > .05$						F = 1.34		$P > .05$	

* Educational status 4 was not included in the variance ratio (F) calculations due to the small size of this group.

TABLE XII

Educational Status by Grade Point Average, Males Only

	Educational Status	1		2		3		4		5		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Grade	> 2.0	47	28	57	34	36	22	3	2	24	14	167	100
	< 2.0	42	20	124	59	2	1	2	1	40	19	210	100
Average	unknown	9	24	21	55	0	0	2	5	6	16	38	100
	totals	98	24	202	49	38	9	7	2	70	17	415	101

Educational status 4 & 5 combined for x^2 calculations.

df = 6 $x^2 = 62.3$ $P < .001$

Educational Status by Grade Point Average, Females Only

	Educational Status	1		2		3		4		5		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Grade	> 2.0	46	23	69	35	38	19	2	1	42	21	197	99
	< 2.0	10	11	52	58	0	0	6	7	21	24	89	100
Average	unknown	9	33	8	30	2	7	2	7	6	22	27	99
	totals	65	21	129	41	40	13	10	3	69	22	313	100

Educational status 4 & 5 combined for x^2 calculations.

df = 6 $x^2 = 36.4$ $P < .001$

TABLE XIII

Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Grade Point Average, Males Only

	Educational Status	2A		2B		2C		2D		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Grade	2.0	22	39	2	3	13	23	20	35	57	100
	2.0	26	21	45	36	48	39	5	4	124	100
Average	unknown	8	38	8	38	2	10	3	14	21	100
	Totals	56	28	55	27	63	31	28	14	202	100

df = 6 $X^2 = 23$ $P < .001$

Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Grade Point Average, Females Only

	Educational Status	2A		2B		2C		2D		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Grade	2.0	21	30	5	7	13	19	30	43	69	99
	2.0	12	23	10	19	27	52	3	6	52	100
Average	unknown	1	12	2	25	1	12	4	50	8	99
	Totals	34	26	17	13	41	32	37	29	129	100

df = 6 $X^2 > 23$ $P < .001$

TABLE XIV

Educational Status by Sex

Educational	1		2		3		4		5		totals	
Status	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Males	98	24	202	49	38	9	7	2	70	17	415	101
Females	65	21	129	41	40	13	10	3	69	22	313	100
Totals	163	22	331	45	78	11	17	2	139	19	728	99

df = 4 $x^2 = 9.01$ $P < .10 > .05$

Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Sex

Educational	2A		2B		2C		2D		totals	
Status	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Males	56	28	55	27	63	31	28	14	202	100
Females	34	26	17	13	41	32	37	29	129	100
Totals	90	27	72	22	104	31	65	20	331	100

df = 3 $x^2 = 16.5$ $P < .001$

TABLE XV

Educational Status by Time of Dropping Out, Males Only

	Educational Status	1		2		3		4		5		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Time of Dropping Out	Semester 1	9	11	54	65	0	0	1	1	19	23	83	100
	Semester 2 & 3	35	26	78	58	2	1	0	0	19	14	134	99
	Semester 4	30	33	33	36	10	11	5	6	13	14	91	100
	Semester 5,6, & 7	24	22	37	35	26	24	1	1	19	18	107	100
	totals	98	24	202	49	38	9	7	2	70	17	415	101

Educational status 4 & 5 combined for x^2 calculations.

df = 9 $x^2 > 29$ $P < .001$

Educational Status by Time of Dropping Out, Females Only

	Educational Status	1		2		3		4		5		totals	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Time of Dropping Out	Semester 1	4	8	30	59	0	0	2	4	15	29	51	100
	Semester 2 & 3	23	25	48	52	1	1	4	4	17	18	93	100
	Semester 4	22	24	26	29	30	33	0	0	13	14	91	100
	Semester 5,6, & 7	16	20	25	32	9	12	4	5	24	31	78	100
	totals	65	21	129	41	40	13	10	3	69	22	313	100

Educational status 4 & 5 combined for x^2 calculations.

df = 9 $x^2 > 29$ $P < .001$

TABLE XVI

Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Time of Dropping Out, Males Only

	Educational	2A		2B		2C		2D		totals	
	Status	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Time of Dropping Out	Semester 1	12	22	32	59	4	7	6	11	54	99
	Semester 2 & 3	24	31	13	17	30	38	11	14	78	100
	Semester 4	9	27	2	6	15	45	7	21	33	99
	Semester 5,6, & 7	11	30	8	22	14	38	4	11	37	101
	Totals	56	28	55	27	63	31	28	14	202	100

df = 9 $x^2 > 28$ $P < .001$

Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Time of Dropping Out, Females Only

	Educational	2A		2B		2C		2D		totals	
	Status	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Time of Dropping Out	Semester 1	9	30	9	30	5	17	7	23	30	100
	Semester 2 & 3	11	23	7	15	19	40	11	23	48	101
	Semester 4	6	23	1	4	7	27	12	46	26	100
	Semester 5,6, & 7	8	32	0	0	10	40	7	28	25	100
	Totals	34	26	17	13	41	32	37	29	129	100

df = 9 $X^2 = 19.40$ $P < .05 > .02$

$X^2_{yates\ cor.} = 14.31$ $P_{yates\ cor.} < .20 > .10$

TABLE XVII

Educational Status and Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Reasons for Leaving, Males Only (% indicated in parenthesis)

	Educational Status	1	2	2A	2B	2C	2D	3	4	5	totals
	1	19(19)	68(67)	16(16)	16(16)	31(30)	5 (5)	1 (1)	1 (1)	13(13)	102(101)
	2	1 (6)	14(83)	7 (41)	2 (12)	2 (12)	3 (18)			2 (12)	17(101)
	3	9 (21)	21(50)	5 (12)	9 (21)	5 (12)	2 (5)			13(30)	43(101)
	4	12(48)	6 (24)	1 (4)		2 (8)	3 (12)	1 (4)		6 (24)	25(100)
	5	12(29)	22(54)	6 (15)	4 (10)	11(27)	1 (2)			7 (17)	41(100)
	6		6 (15)	2 (5)		2 (5)	2 (5)	35(83)	1 (2)		42(100)
Reasons	7	1	1	1					1	1	4
	8	1	2	1			1			1	4
for	9	4								1	5
	10	2	1			1					3
Leaving	11	14(82)	2 (12)	1 (6)		1 (6)				1 (6)	17(100)
	12		1	1							1
	13	2	1	1							3
	14	4	3		1	1	1	1		1	5
	15	16(33)	19(39)	3 (6)	5 (10)	5 (10)	6 (13)		1 (2)	12(25)	48(99)
	unknown	6 (12)	32(64)	10(20)	9 (18)	11(22)	2 (4)	2 (4)		9 (18)	49(100)
	Totals	101(24)	201(49)	55(13)	57(14)	62(15)	27(7)	40(10)	4 (1)	67(16)	413(100)

TABLE XVIII

Educational Status and Educational Status 2 Subgroups by Reasons for Leaving, Females Only
(% indicated in parenthesis)

	Educational Status	1	2	2A	2B	2C	2D	3	4	5	totals
	1	8 (14)	35(62)	9 (16)	5 (9)	16(28)	5 (9)	1 (2)	3 (5)	10(18)	57(101)
	2	5 (21)	13(54)	6 (25)		2 (8)	5 (21)	1 (4)	1 (4)	4 (17)	24(100)
	3	5 (28)	5 (28)	1 (6)	1 (6)	2 (11)	1 (6)	1 (6)	3 (17)	4 (22)	18(101)
	4	6 (33)	6 (33)	1 (6)	4 (22)	1 (6)		1 (6)		5 (28)	18(100)
	5	1	6		1	5					7
	6		3 (8)			1 (3)	2 (5)	34(89)		1 (3)	38(100)
Reasons	7	1	1		1				1	4	7
	8	2	2	1			1		1	3	8
for	9	1	2				2			4	7
	10	3	1	1							4
Leaving	11	9 (56)	3 (18)	2 (12)		1 (6)				4 (25)	16(99)
	12	2 (7)	13(48)	6 (22)		4 (15)	3 (11)		1 (4)	11(40)	27(99)
	13	4 (33)	6 (50)	2 (17)	1 (8)		3 (25)			2 (17)	12(100)
	14		3	1		1	1		1		4
	15	14(28)	22(44)	5 (10)	2 (4)	7 (14)	8 (16)	1 (2)	2 (4)	11(22)	50(100)
	unknown	1 (6)	9 (55)	2 (12)	1 (6)	1 (6)	5 (31)			6 (38)	16(99)
	Totals	64(20)	130(41)	36(11)	17(5)	41(13)	36(11)	39(12)	13(4)	69(22)	315(99)

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT STUDY, DS#3
U.C. Berkeley
Stanford University

I. Please state why you came to college and what your plans were:

A. What were your mother's and your father's attitudes about your plans?

B. How much schooling did your mother complete?
Her occupation:

How much schooling did your father complete?
His occupation:

C. Why did you choose U.C. Berkeley?

II. Please describe what your academic, social and personal experiences at Berkeley were like and how you felt about them.

III. What were your reasons for leaving Berkeley? (Please be as comprehensive as you can.) Do you see your reasons differently now?

I had to leave U.C. Berkeley in order to complete a degree in____________________
(field) at____(school or campus).

A. What do you think was the main thing that made you decide to leave?

B. Before you definitely decided to leave Berkeley, did you do anything to try to make the situation better so you could stay. What did you do?

C. What do you think might have helped you to stay?

D. What might the University, or people connected with the University have done to help you stay?

E. How have your mother and father reacted to your leaving?

IV. Do you consider the experience at Berkeley to have been useful to you in any way? If so, how? If not, why?

V. What are you doing at present?
A. Living at family home___B. Living separately from family______________________
C. Going to school____If so, what school______________________________
D. Working___If so, type of work______________________________Temporary______
Permanently_____ E. Other____

List your current activities and interests other than school or work:

VI. What are your plans for the future? (If they include college, please state if you can, what college.)

When leaving U.C. Berkeley, did you file for:
Honorable Dismissal_____(Medical_____ Dean's Office_____)
Leave of Absence____
Other____

VII. The following are some reasons given by students as contributing to their leaving a college. Please underline all those that apply to you and then number the first three in the order of their importance in each section. Feel free to add any clarifying comments.

A. Circumstances:
Insufficent finances: Mine____ my family's____
Inadequate housing
Acute illness
Too difficult to commute
Change in family circumstances (please indicate what)________________________
____
Got married, or plan to soon
General health
Other____

B. Academic:
Courses
Not prepared for college level work
Courses not appropriate to what I wanted to do
Courses not well taught
Not enough help from teacher or T.A.
Not enough help from University officials
Not interested in the courses taken
Difficulty going to class regularly
Difficulty in keeping up my studying
Didn't seek help (from teacher or counselor) soon enough
Didn't work hard enough
Didn't like department I planned to major in
Pressure for grades too great
Discouraged by low grades
Other____

C. Personal:
Got too involved in outside activities, as________________________
Spent too much time having fun
Spent too much time with friends
Prefer a smaller college
Discovered college was not what I wanted to do
Didn't like campus life
Felt lonely, hard to make friends
Felt like a "nobody," or a "nothing."
Not sure what I wanted to do in life
College life too different from high school
College life too similar to high school
Prefer a socially or politically more conservative campus atmosphere
Other students' ideas too different from mine
Felt I wanted to be independent, take care of myself
Wanted to be closer to home or at home
Wanted to be further away from home
Had personal problems (if you can, state what they were)________________
Other____